WITHDRAWN 12390

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

POLITICAL NATIVISM IN TEXAS 1825-1860

A Dissertation

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF PHILOSOPHY OF THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

SISTER PAUL OF THE CROSS McGRATH, M. A.
of
The Sisters of Divine Providence,
San Antonio, Texas

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
WASHINGTON, D. C.
1930

COPYRIGHT, 1930, BY
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

PREFACE

The purpose of this study is to trace nativism in Texas from its first appearance in the State of Coahuila and Texas to the Civil War. The causes which gave rise to this movement are presented as accurately and dispassionately as possible.

The first chapter is not intended to be an original contribution, but its content was deemed necessary as a background to the treatment of the history of nativism in Texas. In the preparation of this chapter I have made use of special monographs and have drawn upon general historical works which cover the period.

In its earlier phases nativism in Texas has few extant records. However, this paucity of source material was partly relieved by the labors of an able and impartial historian, Dr. Eugene C. Barker, who has made a close study of the period prior to 1836, and some of whose works bear directly upon this subject. Since nothing has been written on nativism in the periods 1843-1845 and 1854-1860, I have based my study of them exclusively upon public records, newspaper files, and contemporary correspondence. The newspaper files for the period 1843-1845 are very limited and very incomplete; the journals of the Congress of the Republic of Texas and the journals and debates of the Texas constitutional convention of 1845 were the main sources for this period.

In studying Know-Nothingism in the period 1854-1860, the contemporary newspaper files were valuable aids. These papers recorded the proceedings of the state conventions and other political activities of the party. Again these files, with one or two exceptions, were also incomplete; hence, information which would have been of great value for this study was unavailable. Another class of public records very important for this study was the official canvasses of votes, for the popular support of the nativists' tickets showed the strength of the party in the state as a whole and in its various counties. For following up nativists' attempts at law-making, the journals of the state legislature, 1855-1860, were closely investigated and freely drawn upon.

Access to the above sources was obtained through the courtesies

of Miss Harriet Smithers, Archivist of the Texas State Library, and Mrs. Mattie Austin Hatcher and Miss Allen, Archivists of the University of Texas Library.

At the Catholic University of America courses in Politics and History were pursued under Doctor Richard J. Purcell, and in History under Doctor Martin R. P. McGuire.

I take this occasion to express my sincere appreciation to those who have assisted me in the preparation of this work.

To my Superiors and Congregation I am deeply grateful for the privileges I have enjoyed as a student at the Catholic University of America.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE iii

CHAPTER I.—GENERAL SURVEY OF NATIVISM IN THE UNITED STATES FROM COLONIAL TIMES TO THE CIVIL WAR 1

Definition of nativism—Chief features—Earliest traces—Gradual extension to all colonies—Existence in the states—Ultimate aim—Unorganized and organized phases—Catholic hostility augmented by Revolution of 1688—Colonial wars and Quebec Act—Prejudices softened by the whole hearted coöperation of the Catholics in the Revolutionary War—National Constitutional Convention established religious equality—Attitude of the National Constitutional Convention toward foreigners—Opposition to the Constitution due to anti-Catholic prejudices—Bill of Rights incorporated guaranteeing religious freedom—Catholics still denied civil and political rights in some states—Manifestations of nativism modified by time and prejudice—Nativism in 1798—Nativism in Hartford Convention of 1814—Nativism about 1830—Protestant associations founded—Aim—Climax of anti-Catholic hostility reached about 1834—Nativism organized politically but locally about 1835—Grievances against the foreigner in the Mississippi Valley about 1840—American Republican party organized in Louisiana in 1841—Rapid growth—Philadelphia riots—National organization of Native Americans formed at Philadelphia in 1845—Nativism in the wane—Native American National Convention at Pittsburgh 1847—Nativist secret societies—Factors which gave rise to Know-Nothingism — Know-Nothingism organized — Factors which accelerated the growth of the Know-Nothing party—Chief features of the Know-Nothing movement—Outstanding strongholds of Know-Nothingism—Success in municipal and state elections in 1854—Success in state elections in 1855—National Convention at Philadelphia in 1855—Slavery issue discussed — Party sectionalized — National Convention at Philadelphia in 1856—Slavery issue again emasculated convention—Nominations made for the presidency and vice-presidency—Presidential campaign of 1856—Last national

PAGE

council at Louisville 1857—Oaths and obligations abandoned —National Council disbanded—Attempts at the reorganization of nativism—Opposition party organized in the Southern states—Purpose—State campaigns in the South in 1859—National reorganization of nativism checked by John Brown's raid on Harper's Ferry October, 1859—Attempts at the formation of a national party abandoned—Summary.

CHAPTER II.—THE RISE OF NATIVISM IN TEXAS, 1825–1836 25

Mission period followed by era fraught with political and racial problems—Mexican Independence established—Iturbide becomes emperor — Colonization law of 1823 — Iturbide dethroned—Republican form of government adopted—Federal colonization law of 1824—Colonization law of State of Coahuila and Texas passed 1825—American immigration to Texas—Racial animosity between Mexicans and American colonists on Hayden Edwards' Grant—Annulment of Edwards' contract—The Fredonian revolt—Antagonistic spirit gradually spread to other colonies—Characteristics of the two races different—Political training different—Attitude towards slavery different—Attitude toward the official religion different—Manifest desire of the United States to get possession of Texas—Decree of April 6, 1830—Governmental regulations concerning marriage—Evidences of hostility to Catholics in Austin's written records—Anti-Catholic legislation—Protestantism legalized—Evidences of anti-Catholic hostility in the documents of the Texas Revolution—Summary.

CHAPTER III.—NATIVISM IN THE REPUBLIC OF TEXAS, 1836–1845 39

Evidences of nativism in the Constitutional Convention of 1836—Anti-alien acts 1837—Evidence of the disappearance of nativism in land act of 1838—Companies and individuals interested in the colonization of Texas—Land act of 1841—Acts authorizing the President to make contracts with companies and individuals — Typical colonization contracts — Few arrivals before 1843—Causes assigned — Immigration from Europe increased in 1843—Gradual rise of anti-foreign hostility—Evidences of anti-foreign hostility in the Land Commissioner's report of 1843—Evidences in act to repeal the law authorizing the President to form colonization contracts passed in 1844—Evidences in debates in Constitutional convention in 1845—Summary.

PAGE

CHAPTER IV.—TEXAS POLITICS, 1845–1854..... 62

A. Attempts at political organization.

Texas slow in adapting itself to party alignment on national issues—No political issues of a nature to give an impetus to party formation agitated—Ineffectual attempts to organize the Democratic party—Attempt in 1846—Mexican War intervenes—Attempt in 1848—Attempt in 1852—Whigs unorganized become interested in national affairs—Fourth attempt at Democratic organization early in 1853—Last attempt prior to rise of Know-Nothingism April 1855.

B. Foreign element in Texas in 1855.

Mexicans accused of fraternizing with slaves—Mexicans accused of assisting slaves to escape to Mexico—Political grievances against Mexicans—Economic grievances against Mexicans—German immigration to Texas—Germans massed in western counties—German communities highly characteristic of the homeland — National ideals fostered — German societies — Competition between free and slave labor—Activities of political refugees—Germans take greater interest in politics—German mass meeting at San Antonio 1854—Significance—Platform of political principles adopted—French element in Texas—French socialists arouse strong opposition—French socialists hostile to Catholicism — Non-Catholic sectarian press augment hostility to Catholicism—Summary.

CHAPTER V.—KNOW-NOTHINGISM IN TEXAS, 1854–1860. 79

Inklings of Know-Nothingism in Texas—Gain municipal elections in San Antonio—Gain mayoralty in Galveston—Secret state convention—Adopt a state ticket—Democratic mass meeting at Austin—Publicity given to existence of Know-Nothing party in Texas—Democrats announce themselves for state offices—Know-Nothing candidates deny affiliation with the Know-Nothing party—Democrats demand every aspirant for office to answer questions—Anti-Know-Nothing press—Know-Nothing press — Outstanding Democrats denounce Know-Nothing movement — Significant withdrawals — Mass meetings—Resolutions adopted—Germans assailed by Know-Nothing party—Germans deny allegations made against them—Hostility of Know-Nothing party hasten political alignment of Germans—Campaign of 1855 animated—Anti-Know-Nothings warned against voting the bogus ticket—Election returns, 1855—Know-Nothing party's success in campaign did not measure up to expectation—Catholic priests and people of Bexar County vilified—Houston's letter of identi-

PAGE

fication with Know-Nothing party—Reaction of Democrats to Houston's letter—Anti-Catholic hostility during the campaign of 1855—Charges against Catholics refuted—Barbecues at Austin—Houston's speech at the Know-Nothing barbecue—Attacks on the Catholics repelled—Democrats organize—Resolutions drawn up at mass meetings—Houston condemned—Know-Nothingism in State Legislature—Campaign of 1856—Interest in Democratic State Convention stimulated—Proceedings of Democratic State Convention—Democratic state ticket—Proceedings of Know-Nothing State Convention—Know-Nothing state ticket—Similarity of Know-Nothing party's platform to the national Know-Nothing party's platform—Frémont no supporters in Texas—Fillmore's ticket temporarily ignored—Fillmore's Albany speech—Fillmore's Erie Letter—Fillmore's previous administration condemned—Attempt to misrepresent Buchanan's attitude toward slavery—Democrats defend Buchanan—Campaign of 1856 decisive Democratic victory—Election returns, 1856—In San Antonio mob violence threatened—Know-Nothing party disorganized—Campaign of 1857—State convention at Waco—Democratic state ticket—Independent state ticket supported by the Know-Nothings—Campaign of 1857 animated—Houston's career in the United State Senate condemned—Joint canvasses—Campaign another Democratic victory—Election returns, 1857—Cart War—Debates in State Legislature on Cart War—Know-Nothingism a factor in state politics in 1858—Opposition party formed—Campaign of 1859—Democratic state ticket—Opposition ticket—Exciting and acrimonious campaign—Slave trade a false issue—Decisive victory for the Opposition party—Election returns, 1859—Houston's stand against secession—State Convention adopt an Ordinance of Secession—Ordinance ratified by the people—Summary.

CONCLUSION 183

APPENDIX 186

Houston's letter of identification with Know-Nothingism—Oaths taken by Know-Nothing Party—Platform of principles of German mass meeting in San Antonio.

BIBLIOGRAPHY 201

INDEX 207

POLITICAL NATIVISM IN TEXAS, 1825-1860

CHAPTER I

General Survey of Nativism in the United States From Colonial Times to the Civil War

Nativism, or an attitude of hostility to all supposedly un-American influences in every phase of American life, is an inheritance peculiar for the most part to the Anglo-Saxon race and had its inception in the Protestant Reformation. Its chief features were identical with those of early Puritanism. Both were characterized by a spirit of exclusiveness in religion and politics, a deep-rooted inherited hatred for everything Catholic and a strong opposition to foreigners.

The earliest traces of nativism in America are found in the Plymouth Colony: in 1636 a land act was passed there which stated that persons born in the colony, and after them persons not born in but reared in the colony were to be given land in preference to any newcomers from England or elsewhere. Like tendencies were soon manifested in the other Puritan colonies. This growing hostility to the foreigner was actuated by a desire to maintain exclusive possession of the soil, a monopoly of the government, and the permanent existence of the State Church.

However, nativism did not confine its activities to the Puritan colonies. Within the period prior to 1860, it was active at one time or another in a greater or less degree, first in every English colony, and later in most of the states where the native population came in contact with the non-English nationalities.

The ultimate aim of nativism, according to the declarations of its leading exponents, was the creation of a homogeneous American society. And, regarding the Catholic Church as the visible symbol of foreign influence, it attempted to bar native Catholics as well as foreign-born citizens from office and from the elective franchise. It tolerated the presence of the foreigner only on condition that he willingly adopted American ideas and thereby hastened his absorption into American society.

If one views nativism from the aspect of organization, its existence prior to 1860 may be divided into unorganized and organized phases. The former, extending from colonial days to 1835, revealed itself in sporadic attacks—at one time anti-Catholic and at another, antiforeign; while the latter, embracing the period from 1835 to the Civil War, assumed the forms of nativist associations, nativist societies, and political parties. In this period the two sentiments (antiforeign and anti-Catholic), merged, became the driving force of every nativist outburst.

In the early part of the unorganized period the anti-Catholic hostility was very pronounced. After the Revolution of 1688, acting in conformity with England's design to extirpate Catholicism within her jurisdiction, each colony enacted its penal code. These, although not equally severe, practically deprived Catholics of their legal existence in English Colonial America. The fact that the dethroned royal family, then living in France, was viewed as a standing menace to Protestantism in England and in her colonies tended to prolong this period of intolerance toward Catholics. Moreover, during the colonial wars when England and the colonies were fighting France, the Catholics were again suspected of being disloyal to England and of aiding or, at least, sympathizing with the French. Consequently, each of these wars augmented Catholic hostility, revived, and, in some cases, increased the penal legislation.

Anti-Catholic hostility was again aroused in the colonies and in England by the passage of the Quebec Act in June, 1774. This act annexed the Northwest Territory to Canada, recognized the Catholic Church there, and allowed it the same rights and privileges as it formerly possessed under the French government.

The Continental Congress of 1774, referring to the act, characterized it as "in an extreme degree dangerous." In an address to the people of Great Britain the Congress said that it did not think that the Constitution authorized Parliament "to establish a religion fraught with sanguinary and impious tenets" in any section of the world. This act, it asserted, would increase Catholic immigration to Canada, and create in the Catholic element there a sentiment of loyalty to the English Government—which results, the Congress feared, might in time become a potential danger "to the ancient free Protestant colonies."

The memorial of the Congress to the people of the colonies,

similar in thought, but more tolerant in tone, helped to spread the agitation. The Congress expressed its conviction that the English people, "the defenders of true religion," would not take part against their "affectionate Protestant brethren" in favor of the colonists' open enemies and England's secret enemies, "whose intrigues, for several years past, have been wholly exercised in sapping the foundation of civil and religious liberty."

Despite these anti-Catholic proclamations, the pressing necessity of a united front in the approaching struggle brought about a kindlier spirit and in proportion to their small number in the colonies, Catholics furnished a surprisingly large quota to the revolutionary forces. This whole-hearted support of the Catholics reacted as a powerful force in softening the spirit of intolerance.[1]

After the recognition of the United States by the Catholic countries of France and Spain, Catholic influence grew. But it was the Constitutional Convention that changed the legal status of Catholics in the United States. This Convention met at Philadelphia, May 25, 1787. Since the various religious denominations in the country were represented, the delegates were very cautious about introducing subjects which might lead to religious controversies. Whatever religious discussions took place were centered around the oath of office. The important amendment introduced by Charles Pinckney, "that no religious test or qualification shall ever be annexed to any oath of office under the authority of the United States," was carried.

The treatment of the foreigner was another important topic in this Convention. Men such as John Adams, Alexander Hamilton, and Gouveneur Morris, who later became outstanding leaders of the Federalist party, contended against the policy of permitting foreigners to throw off allegiance to their native land. On the other hand, James Madison—afterwards a prominent anti-Federalist leader—introduced the measure to invite "foreigners of merit and good republican principles" to America. He maintained that those sections of America which had encouraged them most had advanced most rapidly in population, agriculture, and the various

[1] An example of this was shown when on November 5, 1775, Washington, as commander-in chief of the Army, issued official orders for the abolition of "Pope Day", which was the New England substitute for Guy Fawkes' Day.

arts. Gouveneur Morris replied that he did not wish to see "citizens of the world (immigrants) in American Councils," for he did not trust them. Referring to the right of self-expatriation, he declared that the man who shakes off his allegiance to his mother country can never love another.

The campaign in the several states for the ratification of the Constitution found much opposition on religious grounds. However, opposition due to anti-Catholic prejudice was most prominent in Massachusetts and North Carolina. Major Lusk, of the former, said that he shuddered at the thought that "Roman Catholics, Papists and Pagans" might be introduced into office; and that "Popery and the Inquisition" might be established in the United States, while in North Carolina it was feared that the absence of a religious test would make it possible for the Pope to occupy the presidential chair. The regret was even expressed that the Constitution did not exclude "popish priests" from office for "as there was no test required, and nothing to govern them but honor, when their interests clashed with their honor, the latter would fly before the former."

The debates in the ratifying conventions resulted in the agreement to incorporate a Bill of Rights. The section referring to religion provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting any establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Although liberty of conscience was guaranteed to Catholics by the National Constitution, some of the states long denied them civil and political rights. The proscriptive provisions of colonial times were not abolished in New York until 1806, in Connecticut, 1816, in Massachusetts, 1833, in North Carolina, 1836, in New Jersey, 1844, and in New Hampshire, 1877.

The manifestations of nativism have been modified by time as well as by prejudice. In the period immediately preceding the Revolution they were anti-British in character; in the period following it they were anti-Royalist; and in the last decade of the eighteenth century they became anti-French and anti-Irish.

The French Revolution (1789) and the Irish Rebellion of 1798 drove many intelligent and educated men to the United States. Those immigrants availing themselves of the liberal naturalization laws became citizens and joined the Republican party,

which was bent on the overthrow of the Federalists. The latter, growing alarmed at the rapid growth of their political opponents, took immediate steps to check the power of the naturalized citizen. In some states an attempt was made to render him ineligible for all the important federal and state offices. In 1798 Massachusetts, followed by New Hampshire and Virginia, led this movement. In the same year Congress passed the Alien Act which extended the probation period for naturalization to fourteen years. The Republicans, who were opposed to antiforeign legislation, repealed this act in 1802, and reduced the period to five years.

Early in the first decade of the nineteenth century, partly due to the check in the current of immigration, the manifestations of nativism disappeared. However, that nativism was dormant rather than dead, and that it needed only an occasion to arouse it to action are evident from the resolves of the Hartford Convention of 1814. In these resolutions the delegates gave expression to their desires to make the foreign-born citizen ineligible for all federal offices.

At the close of the Napoleonic Wars the impediments to immigration—the continental blockade, England's doctrine of citizenship which deterred immigration from the British Isles, and the War of 1812—being removed, a large and steadily increasing stream of immigrants set in. This caused in the late twenties a revival of nativism, which assumed a hostile attitude toward the gradually but recently enlarged political power of foreign-born citizens. This growth in political power had been obtained through the extension of the franchise, effected by the removal of the religious restrictions; through the abolition or reduction of property qualifications; and through an increase in the number of elective officers. However, the cause of the greatest alarm at this time was that a large percentage of the newcomers were Catholics. Nativists looked upon this as part of a well-planned scheme of the Catholic powers of Europe to accelerate the growth and increase the power of the Catholic Church in the United States so as to ultimately control political, religious, and social life.

Notable events gave color to these opinions: (1) the rise of the Holy Alliance, and its hostility to republican institutions; (2) the promptitude of this alliance in stamping out popular movements in Naples in 1820, and in Spain in 1823; (3) the desire of the

Catholic powers to bring into subjection the revolted colonies of the Spanish Empire; (4) the revival of the Jesuit Order; and (5) the establishment of the Saint Leopold Foundation in Austria. Furthermore, it was reported that Frederick Schlegel, a German scholar, a friend of Metternich, and a recent convert to the Catholic Church, delivered in Germany in 1828 a series of lectures in which he declared that Protestantism favored democracy, while Catholicism upheld monarchism; that the revolutions in Europe were consequences of the Reformation; and that the destructive principles underlying them had been fostered in the United States. When, therefore, the Leopold Foundation was established in Austria in 1829, and it, or similar foundations were established in other European countries, the charge was made that the purpose of these establishments was to build up, through Catholic missionary activities and through the promotion of emigration, the "Power of Rome" in the United States so as to destroy democracy.

The Nativists' theory of papal hostility toward American institutions was further confirmed by the publication of the "Brutus letters" in 1834. The author of these letters was none other than S. F. B. Morse, later famous as the inventor of the telegraph. While in Europe he had visited Austria and had become acquainted with the activities of the Leopold Foundation. On his return to America he embodied the information he had obtained, as well as his own opinions on the subject, in a series of letters which he published in the New York press. Regarding the movement as an attempt to subvert American liberties, he suggested preventive measures—a very significant one being to refrain from granting the right of suffrage to the future immigrant. These letters were not confined in their circulation to the State of New York; they received nation-wide attention. Moreover, the cry of papal hostility to republican institutions, which has been the favorite theme of every nativistic agitator down to the present time, had an important source in these letters.

Another event which may be considered a factor in the development of the anti-Catholic hostility of that period was the passage of the Catholic Emancipation Act. Enacted in spite of forceful anti-Catholic agitation, it left a legacy of hate in England. It affected the United States in so far as the anti-Catholic literature,

which had appeared in the English press during the period of agitation, was afterwards widely circulated here.

Evidences of this hostility are many and various. The pastoral letter of the Second Provincial Council of the Catholic Church held at Baltimore in October, 1833, referred to the calumnies current in the press denouncing Catholics as enemies of the Republic. At this time every city containing a large foreign element had its church, its convent school, its orphan asylum, and its Catholic newspaper. In order to secure Protestant ascendency and maintain Republican freedom, it was considered expedient to devise organized resistance to the growth of the Catholic Church. With this end in view Protestant associations were founded in all large cities to resist the encroachments of the Catholic Church, to stay its progress, and to frustrate its plans.

Another evidence of hostility at this time is afforded us in the reaction of the people at large towards the federal appointment of Roger B. Taney, a Catholic, to the chief-justiceship of the United States Supreme Court. This appointment was greeted with loud protestation. However, President Jackson, who had no hostile sentiments either toward religion or race, fearlessly met this opposition.

The climax of this period of anti-Catholic hostility was reached on the night of August 9, 1834, when a number of "evil disposed men" of Boston destroyed by fire the Ursuline Convent of Charlestown.

About 1835 hostility to Catholicism began somewhat to abate, but hostility to the foreign-born seemed to grow stronger in large cities which had a considerable foreign element. New York and New Orleans were the outstanding centers of discontent. In the former, racial animosity was directed against the Irish laborers working on the canals and railroads. There the Nativists complained of the large number of Irish voters and maintained that unless the naturalization laws were changed the foreigner would soon control the government of the City. To prevent this control a Native American press was established. In the fall of 1835 this association nominated James Monroe for Congress on the platform: "Elevate no person of foreign birth to any office of honor, trust or profit in the United States." Monroe refused to accept nomination on that plank. He, too, favored a change in the naturalization

laws, but looked with disfavor upon a movement aiming at the infringement of the rights of foreigners already in the country. In the same year a Native American Democratic Association was organized in New Orleans, and in 1836 it presented a candidate for the mayoralty. Here hostility was directed against the citizens of French extraction who adhered to French manners and French customs and who spoke the French language. The causes, which are said to have given rise to this racial animosity, were: (1) the belief that in case of a war with France this element would not remain loyal to the United States; (2) the fact that alien non-residents could own and inherit real estate in Louisiana; (3) the fact that many plantations and large estates had been mortgaged to foreign capitalists.

Another stronghold of nativism at this time was to be found in Pennsylvania. At the state constitutional convention held at Philadelphia in 1837 a suggestion was even made to exclude foreigners from the state. This was too radical a proposal to receive much consideration. However, a resolution to prohibit foreigners who had arrived in the state after July 4, 1841, from acquiring the right to vote or to hold office gave rise to an animated debate and failed to pass.

In 1837 several memorials petitioning Congress to repeal the naturalization laws then in force, or to modify them so as more effectually to secure to the native citizens the control of the government were presented in the House of Representatives. In this year, John M. Patton, of Virginia, presented a petition in behalf of the Native American Democratic Association of Washington.

About 1840 natives in the Mississippi Valley began to complain of the strength of the foreign vote. In Cincinnati, for example, 50 per cent of the voters were then of foreign birth; whereas the foreigners' voting power in St. Louis and New Orleans was said to be still stronger.

Situations so critical alarmed Nativists. And, since both Whigs and Democrats had refused to espouse their cause by including in their respective platforms a plank to prolong the probation period for citizenship to twenty-one years, the question arose whether a new party should be formed. Ineffectual attempts at the formation of such a party had already been made at Germantown,

Pennsylvania in 1837, and at New York City and at Washington during the presidential campaign of 1840. However, this new party, designated the American Republican party, was only organized at a state convention in Louisiana in 1841. An address recommending national organization for the protection of American principles and the exclusion of foreigners from office was issued from that convention to the people at large. In the same year the party carried the municipal elections in New Orleans. National interest in the movement daily grew; in 1843 it was organized in New York City. There the employment of political patronage by the local Democratic party was the assigned cause of its existence. In this city the movement at first seemed doomed to failure. However, in the fall of 1843 there was a split in the Democratic party, and those who had been opposed to Van Buren's leadership joined the American Republican party and furnished it with experienced leadership. In 1844 it elected James Harper to the mayoralty of New York City on the Native American ticket. This movement spread from New York into New Jersey, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Massachusetts and Connecticut.

In the presidential campaign of 1844 [2] this party supported Clay, the Whig candidate, who was a Nativist; while the foreign-born citizens espoused the cause of Polk, a Democrat. The fact that Frelinghuysen, the nominee for vice-president on the Whig ticket, was looked upon as the incarnation of the whole spirit of "Native

[2] As a prelude to the campaign, the American Republican party provoked riots in Philadelphia, in which Catholics were shot down, and their homes and churches burned in the presence of apathetic civil authorities. In June 1844, a grand jury was packed to consider the riots. Its findings attributed them to the efforts of the Catholics to exclude the Bible from the Public Schools. Catholics had not asked for the exclusion of the Bible, but they had petitioned the School Board to permit their children to use the Catholic version in case the reading of the Bible was prescribed, and this had been denied them.

Members of the party had planned to carry out, in New York, attacks similar to those in Philadelphia, but Mayor Morris had made provision for quelling riots by stern and decisive measures. Moreover, the Catholics, being appraised of the intended attacks, organized to defend their churches, convents and homes. The Nativists confronted by a superior force desisted from violent measures.

Americanism and no Popery," alarmed the Democrats; the latter's press teemed with articles denouncing his candidacy.

The campaign resulted in Clay's defeat. An outburst of indignation against the foreign element followed. This stimulated the growth of the American Republican party. In 1845 it estimated its strength at a total of 110,000. Of this aggregation 48,000 were assigned to New York; 42,000, to Pennsylvania; 14,000, to Massachusetts; 3,000, to New Jersey; 1,000, to Delaware; and 2,000 scattered through other states. At their first national convention held at Philadelphia, July 4, 1845, there were present 141 delegates representing fourteen states. Here the name Native American party was adopted.

Although in 1845 it had six representatives in Congress—four from New York and two from Pennsylvania—through desertion the party became so weak that in 1846 there was only one—a representative from Pennsylvania. This rapid decline of the party was due largely to the fact that other interests such as the Mexican War (1846), the attempt to extend slavery into the territories, the split produced in the Whig and Democratic parties caused by the Wilmot Proviso (1846-1847), the discovery of gold, and the rush to California (1849) were diverting the mind of the nation. The Native American party held its last national convention at Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, in 1847; it made no nominations, but recommended Zachary Taylor for the presidency. In the fall of that year the party gave place to secret societies. These societies continued the agitation against Catholics and foreigners, and in time they furnished the Know-Nothing movement with its secret system of politics. Their number increased rapidly; in New York City and Brooklyn, in 1852, there were about sixty nativist organizations. Unknown to the public they had been exercising their influence in local, in state, and in national campaigns long before Know-Nothingism made its appearance.

Beginning with the year 1846 the influx of foreigners was remarkably heavy. The majority of these immigrants were victims either of the Irish famine or of the political revolutions in Europe. They settled in industrial centers and built up in the large cities a foreign element which in some cases became numerically as strong as the native population. The fact that many of these were Catho-

lics aroused Nativists to action. A "No-Popery" newspaper, *The North American Protestant,* was founded in 1846, and the so-called disclosures and lectures on auricular confession by Giustiniana, published about the same time, kept alive anti-Catholic hostility. Evidences of this hostility may be found in the debates in a number of constitutional conventions about 1850.

In the New Hampshire state convention, Mr. Cass, a Democrat, proposed a resolution recommending the insertion of an article in the Constitution that "No one who is bound by an oath of allegiance to any monarchical or foreign power whatever, or who is bound by his religious faith to put down free toleration, shall at any time hold any office of trust or profit in the State." Interpreting this proposition in the light of his speech, which followed, it seems to have been intended to disqualify not only naturalized citizens for public office but also native Catholics. In a constitutional convention in Kentucky in 1850, Nativists, while attempting to deprive naturalized citizens of the right of suffrage, manifested bitter hostility toward Catholics.

From these outbursts of nativism it is evident that the ground was already prepared for the development of a deeper and more significant movement, Know-Nothingism, the causes of which the writer shall now attempt to analyze.

American citizens were deeply interested in the European continental struggle between reactionaries and liberals. Particularly was attention focused upon the attitude of the Catholic Church toward the movement. The fact that in all instances Pope Pius IX sided with the reactionary governments created bitter comments on the part of Nativists. They again brought forth their old-time argument that Catholics could not approve of Papal despotism and at the same time be honestly faithful to American republican principles.

Furthermore, the reaction following the suppression of the continental revolutionary wave of 1848 forced many who had taken part in it to seek homes in America. These carried with them an inextinguishable bitterness for the Catholic Church, associated as it was in their minds with the triumphant enemy at home. Some of them denounced the Pope, the Catholic Church in general, and the Jesuits in particular, as enemies of the State.

Closely connected with these enemies of the Church was the Hungarian exile, Louis Kossuth. He came to America as the guest of the nation in 1852; he was met in New York by cheering crowds and delegates from every conceivable social group. After his reception by Congress, he toured the country in quest of pecuniary and other material aid. On this tour he was given an enthusiastic reception in all the cities through which he passed. Catholics alone held aloof from this momentary hero worship. The following reasons were given in justification of their conduct: (1) Kossuth had been identified with the Socialist party in Europe, which party aimed at the destruction of all religions, and every form of government; (2) his anti-Catholic attitude had already become known, for, prior to his arrival in the United States, the American press had given publicity to the anti-Catholic speech which he delivered at Southhampton, England; (3) he had praised the English government whose misrule had consigned thousands of Irishmen to untimely graves and reduced other thousands to the necessity of either seeking homes in foreign lands or of starving at home; (4) he had virtually given his sanction to the penal law enacted by the British Parliament against the reëstablishment of the Catholic hierarchy.

His anti-Catholic speeches were not confined to Europe alone. In St. Louis he referred to the Papacy as the most corrupt government then in existence, and, to the Pope as an Italian despot in league with the Jesuits and the Czar of Russia to crush out liberalism in Catholic Poland. He declared that the rights and freedom of Protestants had always been strongly opposed by the Hapsburgs; that the latter had been at all times closely allied with the spirit of Jesuitism; and that the Jesuits had been excluded from every Catholic country of Europe because they were a menace to religion and social order. These statements augmented in the popular mind former suspicions of papal despotism and Jesuitical intrigues.

Further to augment anti-Catholic hostility street-preaching was revived by Gavazzi, an ex-priest and revolutionary exile. The movement developed so rapidly that, by 1854, every city of any importance had its anti-Catholic preacher. Priests were described as given to every form of low debauchery, and nuns, as leading lives of infamy and shame. All the crimes alleged against the popes in the

Middle Ages were rehearsed. Coincident with this movement the anti-Catholic press was very active. It took notice of every happening which tended to promote hatred of Catholicism.[3]

However, these movements form but the prelude to a greater anti-Catholic movement, which began at the close of the campaign of 1852. This campaign began with the holding of national conventions; both parties (Democrats and Whigs) convened at Baltimore. The Democrats nominated General Pierce, while the Whigs by a bare majority nominated General Scott. The personalities of the candidates formed the only real issue in the campaign. The batteries of calumny and abuse were soon opened. Pierce was pictured as a coward in the Mexican War, a drunkard in private life, and charged with the responsibility for the retention of the odious religious disability clause in the New Hampshire constitution. On the other hand, Scott's identification with nativism was given wide publicity. He was accused of participation in the attempt made in 1840 at the Astor House in New York to found a Native American party; of affiliation with the American Republican party in 1841; of manifest hostility to Catholics in 1844, and again in 1848; and of being the author of a letter advocating the lengthening of the probation period for citizenship to twenty-one years.

Pierce spent the period of his candidacy in dignified retirement; whereas Scott toured the country and made strong appeals to the Irish and German elements for their votes. However, his appeal was in vain, for his past political record was a proof of his antipathy for foreigners. Pierce carried every state except Massachusetts, Vermont, Kentucky, and Tennessee, and received 254 electoral votes; whilst Scott carried only four states and received only 42 electoral votes.

[3] A typical illustration is afforded us in the Madai family episode. When Reformation prejudices were aroused in England by the reëstablishment of the Catholic hierarchy, the story of this noble Tuscan family, who were said to have been imprisoned for reading the Protestant Bible, was published. The anti-Catholic press in America reprinted the incident and thereby fanned the flame of resentment. Numerous editorials were written on the subject, and the general conclusion was that the Catholic Church, judged by its own acts, was a foe of religious liberty.

Due to the balance of political power possessed by the foreign element, as demonstrated in this national campaign, as well as to the many causes already mentioned, the new nativist party, historically known as the Know-Nothing party, was organized in New York shortly after the inauguration of President Pierce. All anti-Catholic and nativist secret societies then in existence amalgamated with it. Its rapid growth and spread was accelerated by: (1) the economic grievances harbored by the native laboring population against the foreigner, who was accused of overstocking the labor market and keeping wages down; (2) the denationalization of the Whig party caused by the slavery agitation arising from the compromise of 1850, and its subsequent presidential defeat; (3) the President's federal appointments—foreigners sent as ministers abroad—a Frenchman to Spain, a German to the Hague, and a Scotchman to Naples; a large number of foreigners appointed to minor offices within the United States; and, especially the appointment of James Campbell, of Pennsylvania, a Catholic, as Postmaster General; (4) the fact that many good but unthinking men, totally ignorant of the real aims of the party, were attracted by its novelty, secrecy, and mystery.

In addition to these, there were two other factors in the party's rapid ascent to power: (1) the activities of the German political refugees; (2) the arrival of a papal envoy in the United States in 1853.

The German refugees, or "forty-eighters" as they were called, having among them many university students and professors, either edited or controlled most of the German newspapers and periodicals in circulation after 1848. Firmly convinced that there could be no true freedom until Christianity should be abolished, they exhibited a rabid hatred for all religions, but especially for Catholicism—the latter becoming the object of their violent attacks, which contributed in a large measure to augment Catholic hostility. In 1853 they began the formation of political clubs in all the large cities of the Union. The resolutions drawn up at these meetings reflect ultra-radical political, social, and religious doctrines. The following demand may be considered as characteristic:

(1) Abolition of the laws for the observance of the Sabbath; (2) abolition of oaths in Congress; (3) abolition of oaths on the

Bible; (4) abolition of the death penalty; (5) abolition of the presidency and the Senate; (6) abolition of all law suits involving expense; (7) abolition of prayer in the legislature; (8) the right of the people to change the constitution at pleasure; (9) a reduction in the required term for citizenship; and (10) the gradual extermination of slavery.

These doctrines afforded ample evidence that their advocates were not a desirable class to be invested with the rights of citizenship. Furthermore, they furnished the Know-Nothing with a forceful argument against giving the foreigners the right to vote.

The second of these factors, the presence of a papal representative in the person of Cardinal Bedini, was greeted with nation-wide resentment. Bedini had been appointed nuncio to the Court of Brazil, and had been commissioned by Pope Pius IX to visit the United States in order to settle certain disputes between parochial trustees and their respective bishops in the cities of Philadelphia and Buffalo. While in Washington he had an official interview with President Pierce. The Secretary of State, Mr. Marcy, objecting to this, stated that if the Pope had sent a layman, there would have been no obstacle to his reception. This interview aroused the Nativists: an anti-Bedini movement was started—anti-Bedini men travelled through the country and made false charges against the nuncio. As a consequence, the anti-Bedini sentiment grew stronger in the East; while in the West it had become so strong that when the nuncio reached Cincinnati the militia had to be called into action to preserve order. A howling mob, 2,000 strong, paraded the streets, carrying banners bearing such inscriptions as "No Priests!" "No Kings!" "Down with Bedini!"

Moreover, the controversy over the administration of ecclesiastical property was not satisfactorily settled. The trustees of St. Louis church, Buffalo, refused to abide by the nuncio's decision. Furthermore, this decision violated a law, which had been passed in the State of New York in 1784, providing that trustees chosen by a church, congregation, or society should represent it in respect to the ownership of property. The trustees, aware of the existence of this enactment, carried their complaint into the state legislature, and there declared that they had been excommunicated because of their unswerving adherence to the law. The plaintiffs' last grievance was viewed as another act of the intolerance of the Catholic

hierarchy; while the fact that the nuncio's decision was not in conformity with the state law inflamed public resentment. The indignation spread into other states, and in January 1855, J. D. Putnam introduced a bill into the United States Senate to divest the clergy of the power of control over church temporalities.

The first definite information of the character of the Know-Nothing party was obtained from the newspapers of New Orleans and Philadelphia. However, it was the *New York Tribune,* a paper which was to become the outstanding leader of the anti-Know-Nothing press, that gave wide publicity to this information about the party which already had established itself in twelve states by March, 1854.

The first general convention of the party was held in New York, May 14, 1854. As only seven states and the District of Columbia were represented, all important business transactions were deferred for the consideration of a larger gathering which was to take place one month later. This second meeting opened on June 14, with delegates from thirteen states. A Grand Council of the United States was organized to direct the national activities of the party. On June 17, the anniversary of the Battle of Bunker Hill, a constitution and ritual were adopted. These were revised at the meeting of the National Council, held at Cincinnati in November, 1854. However, the public at large possessed no knowledge of the character of this ritual until the beginning of the Virginian campaign of 1855 when its salient features were exposed in the state anti-Know-Nothing press.

In theory, membership in the party was limited to native-born Protestants over twenty-one years of age, born of Protestant parents and not united in marriage with Roman Catholics; whereas in practice, it embraced foreign-born Protestants as well. This only serves to show that the movement (when no other issue was involved) was essentially an anti-Catholic one.

Know-Nothingism possessed the dual characteristics of a secret order and of a political party. In the earlier period of its existence the former preponderated. Members introduced themselves to each other by secret signs; by secret signs and passwords admission was obtained to the secret meetings. Furthermore, this secrecy existed even within the ranks of the party itself. The rank and file of the

members knew little of the secrets of the officials at whose commands they blindly cast their votes.

As to organization, its structure was hierarchical. It embraced three grades or ranks, and a special oath had to be taken for admission to each. All members of the party took the first degree oath; those, considered competent to hold office within the party, were admitted to membership in the second rank by taking the second degree oath; while those who were looked upon as being competent to fill local, state, or national public offices were admitted to the highest rank by taking the third degree oath.

The outstanding strongholds of the Know-Nothing party were the Northern cities in which a large Catholic foreign element existed, and the Southern cities possessing a large German element.

In the South it had ardent partisans among the slaveholding population. That class was interested in seeing a powerful barrier erected against immigration, for it was convinced that the immigrant came with pre-conceived prejudices against slavery, and it was also aware of the fact that the preponderance of the North over the South in federal power was in part due to the foreign vote. In the West, outside of far-off California, there was then neither a slavery issue nor a foreign problem; consequently, this section was unfavorable to the growth of the Know-Nothing party. Furthermore, the Republican party founded there in 1854 swept the Know-Nothings of that region into its ranks. In California, however, there was a strong antiforeign sentiment directed against foreign miners who were carrying gold out of the country.

The entry of the party into the field of politics was first noticed in 1854 when it attempted to get control of the governments of a large number of cities both in the North and in the South. In 1855 it broadened the field of its endeavors and directed its efforts towards the acquisition of state control; whereas, in 1856 it placed a candidate in the field for the presidency of the United States. It met with remarkable success in New England, where the heavy influx of foreigners revived Puritan prejudices. Massachusetts was an exceptionally fertile field for the growth of this party. Here, in 1854, the Know-Nothing party elected the governor as well as every new member of the State Senate, and 375 out of a total of 379 members of the House of Representatives. In the same year

the elections in New York and Pennsylvania showed that the party had acquired considerable strength in both states. However, it was the state elections of 1855 that tested the real strength of the organization.

One of the first and the most noteworthy elections of that year was held in Virginia. There, Flournoy, a former Whig leader, then the Know-Nothing party's candidate for governor, proclaimed in his letter accepting the nomination that he desired to see members of the Roman Catholic Church excluded from federal and state offices in all departments. The Democratic candidate, Mr. Wise, in an acrimonious and exciting canvass, took up the statement and exposed the unconstitutional designs of the party and thereby won a decisive victory.

The moral effect of this victory upon the other Southern states may be judged from their election returns. The majority of the Democratic ticket was elected in every Southern state except Kentucky; however, the Know-Nothing party secured the Land Commissioner of Texas, the Legislature and Comptroller of Maryland; and in Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana and Texas it elected quotas of the legislative and congressional delegations which were in most cases proportionate to the strength of the former Whig party in the South. In the North, due especially to the intensely anti-Catholic feature of the party, it was more successful. In 1855 it elected governors and legislatures of New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York; while in the West it got control of only far-off California.

The elections of 1855 were the first and the last great victory of the Know-Nothings. The intrusion of the slavery issue in the national council held at Philadelphia, in June, 1855, sectionalized the party. To this meeting the North sent anti-slavery delegates, while the South sent pro-slavery men. A Southerner, E. B. Bartlett, of Kentucky, was elected head of the party. A committee on resolutions made up of delegates from each state and territory, and the District of Columbia was appointed. The work of the committee lasted three days. Two reports were presented to the national council. The majority report presented a pro-slavery platform. It denied the power of Congress to prohibit slavery in the territories, or to abolish it in the District of Columbia, and upheld

LIBRARY 12390

the existing laws on that subject. The minority report presented an anti-slavery platform. The debates in the Council on these reports were bitterly personal, and lasted three days. Finally the pro-slavery platform containing the famous twelfth section on slavery was forced through. This extreme concession to the Southern pro-slavery men resulted in the secession of a large number of northern delegates, headed by Henry Wilson of Massachusetts. The Southerners were delighted with the platform; they held it up as a model for the guarantee of Southern rights, but the party was broken, and its hopes of national success crushed.

Thus, as we have seen, the Know-Nothing party was ill-prepared for the presidential campaign of 1856. The Northern and Southern divisions were growing more and more out of harmony. Many of the Northern states had rejected the slavery plank of the Philadelphia platform of the previous June. However, a number of the moderate Nativists were of the opinion that agreement on the slavery question should not be required as a test of party orthodoxy. But in the South the Know-Nothing state conventions declared in their platform that Congress had no right to legislate on slavery in the territories. They repudiated the doctrine of squatter sovereignty, and declared that they would stand by the Georgia platform which threatened secession in case of further incroachments on the rights of the South. Such was their ultimatum to the anti-slavery wing in the North.

The Know-Nothing party was further denationalized by the contest between the two divisions over the speakership in the House of Representatives. It lasted from December to February, and confirmed the hopelessness of coming to any agreement on the slavery issue.

A few days after the election of Banks, an anti-slavery Know-Nothing man, as Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Know-Nothing party held its national convention at Philadelphia. It had been preceded by a Know-Nothing national council meeting held February 19. This latter body discarded the platform of the previous year and adopted a new one, which avoided an explicit expression on slavery; but which, on the whole, was favorable to the South. The Council condemned the national administration for reopening sectional agitation by the repeal of the

Missouri Compromise. The attitude of this body toward slavery was not satisfactory to the anti-slavery members of the nominating convention. In the convention the latter element made a desperate effort to reject the platform of the council on the ground that the National Council had no authority to adopt it. They failed in their efforts and about fifty of them withdrew from the convention hall. The emasculated body nominated Millard Fillmore for the presidency, and Andrew Jackson Donelson for the vice-presidency.

The Democratic National Convention met at Cincinnati, June 2, 1856. On the seventeenth ballot for president James Buchanan was unanimously nominated, and on the second ballot for vice-president, John C. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, was likewise unanimously nominated.

The Republican party said to have been founded at Ripon, Wisconsin, March 20, 1854, and organized on a national basis at a convention held at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, February 22, 1856, nominated John C. Frémont for the presidency on June 17th, at Philadelphia. His candidacy was supported by the Northern Know-Nothings, though he was suspected of being or of having been a Catholic.

For a time there was an air of indifference in the South in regard to the Know-Nothing candidates. This was partly due to the fact that sectionalism had torn the party to pieces. Many Northern Know-Nothings had joined the Republican party and many Southern Know-Nothings were joining the Democrats.

Fillmore was in Europe at the time of his nomination. However, he forwarded a letter of acceptance and delivered a speech at Albany on his return. In his letter he endorsed the platform adopted by the Know-Nothings at Philadelphia in 1855, and referred to the records of his acts while president as evidences of what was to be expected of him, if he should be elected. It was very significant that, although he had been long in public life and in Congress during the most exciting times of sectional agitation, he did not go back beyond the period of his presidential administration, for such an allusion would have been disastrous to his cause in the South. In his Albany speech he advocated justice to the South, and came out in strong language against a sectional party—undoubtedly the Republican party. Both this letter and this speech increased his prospects in the South.

The election returns gave Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Indiana, Illinois, California, and all the slave states except Maryland to the Democrats; the New England States, New York, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Iowa to the Republicans; and only Maryland to the Know-Nothings.

The returns of the national and the state elections of 1856 showed that the heyday of Know-Nothingism had passed and that the party had practically ceased to exist. The National Council, convened at Louisville in June, 1857, abolished the oaths and degrees of the Order, and then disbanded. However, the growing disaffection, and eventually the split in the Democratic party caused by the question of admitting Kansas under the Lecompton Constitution, stimulated the Know-Nothings to attempt a reorganization of their party. Southern Know-Nothings like the Douglas' Democrats opposed the adoption of the Lecompton Constitution. Senator Crittenden of Kentucky, an outstanding Know-Nothing, came out against it in a powerful speech, which received the unanimous approval of the Southern Know-Nothings.

Taking advantage of this situation, Southern Know-Nothings made an attempt to unite the conservatives of every party and of both sections into an Opposition party having as its primary purpose the overthrow of Democracy. Accordingly, in December, 1858, representatives from thirteen states met at Washington to devise plans for the formation of a conservative National Union party. The decision of the meeting was to nominate for the presidential campaign of 1860 conservative candidates that would attract the conservatives of all parties. This decision received the almost unanimous approval of the Southern Know-Nothings. They suggested that the slavery issue should be divorced from the political activities of the new party, and that the presidential campaign should be made on practical issues which would not involve the slavery question.

The reorganization of Know-Nothingism was begun with considerable enthusiasm. To conceal their identity, the Know-Nothings abandoned their old title and assumed the name of "Opposition party." The Douglas Democrats and some conservative Republicans joined this party. In the state campaigns which followed, Virginia again led. In February, 1859, she held an

Opposition state convention and adopted a state ticket and platform. An exciting gubernatorial contest between Goggin, the Opposition, and Letcher, the Democratic candidate followed. The result, although a victory for Democracy, showed a remarkable increase in the strength of the Opposition party and gave an impetus to the growth of the movement. In 1859 every state in the South except Alabama had its opposition ticket and platform. In Texas, Tennessee, Kentucky, and North Carolina important gains were made. In Texas the party placed its candidates for governor and lieutenant-governor in power, in Tennessee it got control of the legislature and gained four new members for Congress, in Kentucky it gained two congressional seats, while in North Carolina it sent four, or one-half of the delegation to Congress.

Whilst the reorganization movement was thus making rapid progress, John Brown's raid upon Harper's Ferry, in October, 1859, suddenly revived the sectional agitation, and a large share of the blame for this unfortunate incident was charged to the Republican party. The Southern Democrats exposed the dangerous situation in which the South was then placed. The excitement ran high, the rank and file of the Opposition party refused to listen to their leaders, their hatred of the Republican party increased, and, hence, all hope for the formation of a national Opposition party to take part in the campaign of 1860 vanished.

During the contest of 1860 attempts were made to show that the Catholic Church was identified with abolitionism, but evidence to substantiate the charge could not be found. While the Church officially took no part in the struggle which precipitated the war, the pro or con attitude was assumed by individual Catholics in their respective section of the country.

Summary

The purpose of the present chapter has been to sketch in broad lines the general development of nativism to 1860 as a necessary background for an intelligible treatment of the rise and progress of nativism in Texas. Completeness has not been aimed at, nor could it be, for the history of nativism as an organic phase in the development of American civilization remains largely to be written.

The two essential characteristics of American nativism were dislike of the foreigner and hatred of the Catholic Church. The presence of these sentiments may be ascribed almost entirely to the strong spirit of nationalism that characterized the English settlers from the first and which they rapidly passed on to assimilated groups; and to the deeply rooted Reformation prejudices which were the common heritage of the vast majority of the Protestant English settlers in the New World.

From Colonial times to 1835 nativism may be described as spasmodic or unorganized. Its two phases however were seldom equally active. Thus before the Revolutionary Era outbursts against the foreigner were occasioned chiefly by crises like the Colonial Wars. The bitterness of the struggle for Independence, however, the growth of a new national consciousness, and the fears real and imaginary of the dangers from European quarters threatening the Republic in the formative years, engendered a critical and suspicious attitude toward the foreigner which only subsided toward the close of the first decade of the nineteenth century. Aroused again by the War of 1812, this anti-foreign feeling, with the influx of immigration following the Napoleonic wars, already began to assume in its outbursts the forms characteristic of this side of nativism at its full development. On the other hand, the feeling of hatred for the Catholic Church was far more constant and positive. This is only too evident, for example, from the Colonial penal legislation against Catholics, the fanatical outburst against the Quebec Act, the slowness of the States to repeal anti-Catholic legislation from their statute books, although full liberty had been granted to the Catholics by the Federal Constitution, the anger aroused by the passage of the Catholic Emancipation Act in England and at the appointment of Roger B. Taney to the Supreme Court, and by the constant readiness to accept and promote vilification of the Catholic Church which it regarded as a branch of a European monarchism hostile to the spread of republican principles in Europe and longing to overthrow American institutions.

The career of nativism as an organized movement and as a factor in American politics began in the decade between 1830 and 1840. As the main cause of its outbursts was the rapid growth of the Catholic Church, nativism at first assumed the form of local Prot-

estant associations to counteract Catholic influence. As a factor in American local politics it entered the field in 1835 in the form of American Democratic associations, and it attempted to reduce the political power of the foreigner by prolonging the period of probation for citizenship. Alleging that its aim was to crowd out foreign influence, it strove to bar native Catholics as well as foreigners from all political offices. With its aims unmodified, nativism in 1841 extended the area of its activities by organizing the American Republican party. In 1845 this party organized on a national basis, changed its name to Native American party, but after a brief period, due to united efforts perhaps in the war against Mexico, attention was temporarily diverted, and the organization collapsed. As a national movement nativism again appeared in 1854 in the form of a secret political organization which concealed even its name and existence. Holding up as its ideal the protection of American institutions from foreign influence and regarding the Catholic Church as possessing undue power through the influx of immigrants and through the rise of the foreign element in politics, it attempted to check immigration and make nativity and religion a test for office. The activities of this secret organization made a strong appeal to Southern slaveholders because they were convinced that due to the influx of immigrants the North was gaining preponderance in politics and the anti-slavery sentiment was being reënforced. However, this Know-Nothing party from its very beginning contained the germ of dissolution, for its northern wing was anti-slavery and its southern wing pro-slavery in sentiment. These antagonistic attitudes towards slavery denationalized the party in 1856. However, Know-Nothingism continued as a force in American politics until 1860 when the Civil War absorbed the mind of the nation.

CHAPTER II

Beginnings of Nativism in Texas, 1825-1836

Following La Salle's attempt at the establishment of a colony near Matagorda Bay in 1685, Spain undertook the colonization of Texas by the erection of garrisoned missions. The period covered by this unique method of colonization officially came to a close about 1794 with a governmental decree for the secularization of the missions.[1]

The period which followed had political and racial problems to solve. In 1810, during the Spanish peninsular campaign, Mexico started its struggle for political independence, and in 1821 Iturbide led the revolutionary forces triumphantly into the capital of Mexico. Iturbide was then proclaimed emperor by some of his troops, and his elevation to the throne was ratified by the constituent Congress. However, Iturbide, as emperor, had strong opposition, and Santa Anna, a military officer, being aware of this, headed a revolt which ended in the former's deposition in 1823. The following year a federal republic was established.

The Mexican Government viewed with astonishment the rapid increase of population in the United States.[2] Therefore, to attract immigrants to its own unpopulated lands, it passed, January 4, 1823, a very liberal colonization law; this had a brief existence, for Iturbide's expulsion from power March 19, 1823, was accompanied by an abrogation of the legislation of his reign.[3] However, in 1824 another colonization law was passed; its essential characteristics were similar to those of its predecessor; it laid down general regulations with reference to colonization within the Republic,[4]

[1] Garrison, 93.

[2] Stiff, 219.

[3] Yoakum, I, 217-220.

[4] Two important restrictions were: "(1) No land lying within twenty leagues of the boundaries with any foreign nation, nor within ten leagues of the coast, can be occupied by settlers, without the previous approbation of the Supreme Executive Power. (2) Until the year 1840, the general congress shall not prohibit the admission of foreigners to colonize, excepting, indeed, circumstances should imperiously oblige it so to do, with regard to the individuals of any nation."

but provided for the passage of a colonization law by each Mexican state for the settlement of its own unpopulated lands.[5]

In accordance with the regulations embodied in the national law the legislature of the State[6] of Coahuila and Texas passed, March 24, 1825, a State colonization law. This law empowered immigration agents, called empresarios, to contract with the State government to settle a number of families on unoccupied land. A man with a family was to receive 4,428 acres of farming and pasture land, and a single man, one-fourth that amount, but on marrying his allotment was to be increased to that assigned for the head of a family.[7] Each empresario was to receive five leagues[8] and five labors[9] of land for every 100 families which he had introduced. However, he was not to be permitted a premium on more than 800 families.[10] The colonists were to be given six years within which they were to be required to pay a nominal fee for their lands. A sitio, or league of pasture land, was to cost $30; a labor of "irrigable" land $3.50; and of non-irrigable land $2.50. This fee might be paid in three instalments: At the end of the fourth year, the first third was to be paid; at the end of the fifth, the second third; and at the close of the sixth year, the final payment was to be made.[11]

Although Mexico was anxious to colonize Texas, she hesitated about admitting American immigrants. This is made very evident in a committee report on colonization which manifested fear of encroachment on the part of the United States and suggested that "No better protection against such a calamity could be adopted than the settlement there of an industrious population, attached to the Empire by the ties of religion and interest in the land."[12] Accordingly, it was intended to make Texas a Catholic colony. The State law relative to colonization[13] required foreigners who were

[5] Gammel, I, 97-98.

[6] The Mexican Republic united Texas with Coahuila to form one State. The former was promised separate statehood when its population should justify such a measure.

[7] Gammel, I, 101.

[8] A league of land was equivalent to 4,428 acres.

[9] A labor of land was equivalent to 177 acres.

[10] Gammel, I, 101.

[11] Gammel, I, 102.

[12] Barker, *Life of S. F. Austin*, 59.

[13] Gammel, I, 99-106.

already in the State to take an oath to observe the Federal and State constitutions, and to become members of the official church; while newcomers on their arrival were to present evidences of their "Christian and good moral character." This latter is an ambiguous expression; however, the fact that all contracts called for colonists professing the Catholic faith inclines one to conclude that in practice it meant Catholic.

The colonization law was passed at an opportune time for bringing about a stream of immigration from the United States,[14] and hence it met with an immediate response.

The migration of the Anglo-American to Texas sowed the seed of a racial conflict, which began germinating in 1825 in the Department of Nacogdoches. In accordance with the terms of his contract, every empresario was bound to respect titles (previously obtained) to land within his grant.[15] However, the grant of land assigned to one Hayden Edwards, in the Department of Nacogdoches, had Mexicans living on certain sections of it. These resented Edwards' authority. Edwards, to relieve the situation, and contrary to the terms of his contract, proceeded to test the legality of the land claims of the Mexicans. In doing this he overstepped the limit of his rights; hence the Mexicans appealed to the State Legislature. While this affair was still unsettled, an election for alcalde took place in the same Department of Nacogdoches. There were two aspirants for the office: Samuel Norris, an old inhabitant of the Department, and Chaplin, the son-in-law of Edwards. The former was supported by the Mexicans and the latter by the colonists. Chaplin, having received "the votes of the squatters in the border reserve," was elected. However, the adherents of Norris, maintaining the illegality of the elections on the ground that the squatters as foreigners had no right to vote, appealed to the Political Chief at San Antonio; the latter decided in favor of Norris.[16]

[14] "The westward movement, . . . had reached the international boundary, and the flow of population was being held east of the line as if by a dam. . . . The province was easily accessible; the people were at the door. Behind them was the habit of the westward migration; before them was the lure of free land. . . ."—Barker, *Mexico and Texas*, 14.

[15] Kennedy, I, 337, 361.

[16] Barker, *Life of S. F. Austin*, 179-180.

Norris, as Alcalde, was accused of hostility to the American colonists. Some of the latter, even after they had made improvements on their lands, were said to have been deprived of them in favor of Americans.[17] Additional charges were made against Edwards, the final outcome of which were the annulment of his contract and his expulsion from the Republic.[18] However, Edwards, to save his interest in the grant, proclaimed a "Fredonian Republic." As no outside aid had been given to the Fredonians, the rebellion was easily crushed;[19] but the affair, insignificant in itself, had far-reaching consequences.

This spirit of racial hostility gradually spread into the other colonies. It led to the Decree of April 6, 1830,[20] and it eventually became the prime cause of the Texas Revolution.

Aside from antagonistic racial characteristics[21] there were several other factors in the development of this hostility. Centuries of different political training developed in these races different attitudes towards political institutions:

> The English colonist came to America with a training in local self government already centuries old. Roots of the precinct, the county, and trial by jury go back beyond the dawn of English Constitutional history. Parliament and representative system were developed in all their essential characteristics before the great emigration to America in the seventeenth century. Once on this side, the English colonists settled down to more rather than less local independence and responsibility than they had in England. Legally no civil office in America was closed to them, from the office of governor down to constable, . . .[22]

The Spanish colonial system of government had been highly centralized and all the important civil, military, and ecclesiastical posi-

[17] Bancroft, *North Mexican States and Texas*, II, 101.

[18] Barker, *Life of S. F. Austin*, 182.

[19] Bancroft, *North Mexican States and Texas*, II, 103-110.

[20] Cf. p. 31 for this decree.

[21] Dr. Barker thus sums up the characteristics of the two races: "On the one side was the Anglo-American immigrant, blunt, independent, efficient, a rebel against authority, a supreme individualist. On the other side was the Latin-American master of the soil, sensitive, subtle and indirect in his ways, by training and temperament a worshiper of tradition and a creature of authority."—Barker, *Mexico and Texas*, 1.

[22] Barker, *Mexico and Texas*, 2-3.

tions given to men who had been born and reared in Spain. Mexicans had been permitted to hold local offices, but as the law had regulated the detailed functions of such offices, there had been little scope for independent action, and consequently, these men had acquired very little political training. Therefore, in 1824, when Mexico adopted a republican form of government, it had no trained leaders to guide it through its critical period. Hence, as one might expect, a period of confusion " filled with plots and counterplots of factions organized under the rival Scottish rite and York rite Masonic lodges " followed.[23] This aspect of affairs tended to develop in the American colonists in Texas contemptuous sentiments for Mexicans in general, and a certain anxiety concerning their own interests. Foremost among the latter was the institution of slavery.

Although slavery in Mexico was tolerated under Spanish rule, slaves formed only a small fraction of the population. According to Humboldt's calculation the total number in all New Spain in 1793 did not exceed 10,000. This number was further decreased during the Mexican Revolution when all negroes who had joined the revolutionary forces were manumitted.[24]

The vital question (at least for the American colonists in Texas) of the emancipation of all the slaves under Mexican jurisdiction was first considered in the Mexican Congress in connection with the colonization law of 1823. And, although all the members were anxious to abolish slavery, yet, fearing that emancipation might check migration to Mexican territory, they permitted immigrants to bring in their slaves; but they forbade the slave trade and decreed that children born to slaves on Mexican soil should be free at the age of fourteen years.[25] This act becoming inoperative with the downfall of the imperial government,[26] a decree of the Republican Congress issued July 13, 1824, forbade both the domestic and foreign slave trade. Violations of this law were to be severely punished; vessels caught smuggling in slaves were to be confiscated and

[23] Barker, *Mexico and Texas*, 2, 26.

[24] Bugbee, L. G., " Slavery in Early Texas," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. XIII, 390.

[25] *Ibid.*, 395.

[26] *Ibid.*, 395.

"the owner, purchaser, captain, master and pilot were to be condemned to a year's imprisonment," and the smuggled-in slaves were to be automatically free as soon as they stood on Mexican soil.[27]

The Federal Constitution of 1824, and the Federal Colonization law of the same year were silent on the question of slavery; but the State Colonization law of the state of Coahuila and Texas enacted in 1825, alluding to slavery, stated that the colonists should subject themselves to the existing laws and to those that might be passed in the future.[28] Stephen F. Austin, the outstanding American colonist in Texas, consulted Padilla, a Mexican official, in regard to what attitude the colonists should assume toward the Federal Act of July 13, 1824, and toward the clause in the State law of 1825. Padilla stated that the former "could be reasonably interpreted only as prohibiting the slave trade," and that he was of the opinion that the colonists could bring in slaves for their own use.[29] In 1826 the State legislature of Coahuila and Texas was determined to abolish slavery and to insert a clause to that effect in the State Constitution. However, through Austin's influence the clause was modified, so that it provided that children born of slaves, after the date of the publication of the Constitution in the capital of each district, should be free from birth, and that further introduction of slaves should cease after six months.[30] Again, in 1828 Texas' representatives in the State Legislature, José Antonio Navarro and Miguel Arciniega, urged on by Austin, were instrumental in the passage of a law by the State Legislature legalizing the introduction of slaves as indentured servants.[31] At this time, outside of Texas, there were but few slaves in the Mexican Republic. This fact, added to the Mexicans' hostile attitude toward slavery, probably influenced President Guerrero, while possessing dictatorship, to decree in 1829 the abolition of slavery throughout the Republic.[32]

The Mexican officials in Texas refrained from publishing this

[27] *Ibid.*, 397-398.
[28] Barker, *Life of S. F. Austin*, 232.
[29] *Ibid.*, 233.
[30] *Ibid.*, 234-237.
[31] Barker, *Mexico and Texas*, 74-75.
[32] Yoakum, I, 269.

decree and through their mediation Texas was exempted from its operation December 2, 1829.[33] For the next three years the slavery issue in Texas was dormant; however, it again became active in the State colonization law of 1832. A clause was inserted in the latter, which limited to ten years' duration all labor contracts with servants and day laborers that the colonists might introduce.[34] This was the last legislative enactment on slavery prior to 1836. Thus, we have seen that the slavery issue was a continuously disturbing factor in the history of Texas under Mexican rule. Not only did it make the colonists feel insecure in the possession of their slaves, but it also checked immigration from the United States.[35]

Another important element in the racial antagonism was the manifest desire of the United States to get possession of Texas. In 1825, Mr. Poinsett, the United States Minister to Mexico, was instructed to sound the Mexican Government on the question of changing the boundary line agreed to in 1819. The proposition was made, but the latter refused to consider it. Again, in 1827, Poinsett was instructed to propose the purchase of Texas. And, in 1829, Van Buren, as Secretary of State, directed Poinsett to make another offer to purchase Texas. Both attempts failed.[36] These various endeavors to get possession of Texas strengthened the suspicion of the Mexican authorities regarding the designs of the United States. To secure the permanent retention of Texas, the Mexican Congress passed the Decree of April 6, 1830. It was intended to check American immigration and to counteract the rapidly growing power of those Americans already in Texas by establishing colonies of Mexicans and Europeans. The most significant articles of this decree were:

Article 9. The introduction of foreigners across the northern frontier is prohibited under any pretext whatever, unless the said foreigners are provided with a passport issued by the agents of this republic at the point whence the said foreigners set out.

Article 10. No change shall be made with respect to the slaves now

[33] Yoakum, I, 269; Barker, *Mexico and Texas*, 77-79.

[34] Barker, *Life of S. F. Austin*, 257.

[35] Bugbee, L. G., "Slavery in Early Texas," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. XIII, 401.

[36] Yoakum, I, 277-278.

in the States, but the federal government and the government of each State shall most strictly enforce the colonization laws and prevent the further introduction of slaves.

Article 11. In accordance with the right reserved by the general Congress in the seventh article of the Law of August 18, 1824, it is prohibited that emigrants from nations bordering on this Republic shall settle in the States or territory adjacent to their own nation. Consequently, all contracts not already completed and not in harmony with this law are suspended.[37]

Still another factor, and probably the most important, in the development of racial hostility was the religious question. Legally all the colonists were Catholics; consequently, they were expected to conform to the laws of the official church, in which many did not believe, and toward which they usually had inherited prejudices. However, no attempt had ever been made to enforce compliance with the laws of that church.[38] Furthermore, the religious restrictions were considered an obstacle to the rapid colonization of Texas. Austin received many letters from prospective colonists who were anxious to know whether religious toleration existed in Texas. A Kentuckian wrote:

Will Religious toleration be allowed to the Emigrants from the United States, so far as to be exempted from the payment of tithes to the established Church, if they should desire it. And to think and act for themselves in matters of conscience? Provided they do not interfere with the Catholic Religion, and with fidelity support the laws of the land, as citizens ought to do? . . .[39]

Closely associated with the religious grievances of the colonists were the governmental regulations concerning marriage. To be legal the matrimonial contract had to be made in the presence of a Catholic priest. Nevertheless the government, even though it assumed the right of making the clerical appointments for the various colonists, was rather negligent in this respect. In some colonies a Catholic priest could not be reached for years at a time;

[37] Howren, Alleine, Translation from Dublan Y. Lozano's *Legislacion Mexicana*, II, 238-240 in *Southwestern Historical Association* Vol. 16, 382-383.

[38] Barker, *Mexico and Texas*, 63-64.

[39] Cf. John Smith, Ky. to Austin; Austin Papers, Vol. II., Part II, 1242.

consequently, necessity led to the adoption of the civil marriage, which as a rule was legalized on the arrival of a priest.

In his reminiscenses, Henry Smith graphically depicts the scene in a colony on the occasion of the visit of this necessary but unwelcome visitor—the Catholic priest:

> (The clergyman) confined his duties to baptism and marriage ceremonies . . . and all who wished to marry as well also as those who had been banded for years, had now to come forward and have the slip (k)not made fast. He immediately issued his edict forbidding provisional marriages, which rendered it very inconvenient to the people, who lived scattered over a district of country several hundred miles in extent. They, however, paid very little attention to his edict except those immediately in his vicinity. It really looked dry and peculiarly odd to me to see those who had for years been living together as man and wife, and had perhaps a large family step forward to the marriage alter (sic). It seemed to carry with it a kind of acknowledgment of both error and crime . . . though no religious societies were tolerated in Texas, yet prejudices deep rooted by early education rose up in strong opposition, and with many the idea of being baptised by a Roman Catholic Priest carried with it an everlasting stigma and disgrace. . . .[40]

Prior to 1835 direct evidences of the attitude of the colonists toward the Catholic Church are rare. However, if Austin's estimation of the church be considered an index to the prevailing sentiment, a strong anti-Catholic spirit existed. Writing from Monterey to a friend Austin stated [41] that as long as the clergy would continue to exercise their influence in Mexico, fanaticism would exist, and as long as it would exist the people would be slaves and the nation miserable and despised by the whole civilized world, and that therefore to destroy the ecclesiastical power from its very roots would be to save the country from ruin.[42]

[40] Smith, Henry, "Reminiscences of Governor Henry Smith", *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, Vol. XIV, 24-73.

[41] "—Mientras los clerigos tienen su influjo el fanatismo existira y mientras este existe el pueblo seran esclavos—y la nacion miserable y desprecido por todo el mundo civilizado de modo qe distruir hasta las raices del poder eclesiastico es salvar la patria de ruina."

[42] Austin to a friend, May 28, 1825. *Austin Papers*, Vol. II, Part I, 656.

In 1823 on the downfall of the short-lived empire, Austin identified himself with the federalist faction. He wrote:

> A central Republic is the worst Gov't in the world—for all the power will be in the hands of a few men in Mexico and instead of a Republic it will in effect be an aristocracy which is worse than a monarchy, for in it we shall have 100 Tyrants instead of one. . . .[43]

In order to further the cause of the federalists, Austin drafted a federal constitution. According to this draft he would maintain the Catholic Church as the official church, but would subject its activities to state control. He would give Congress the power: (1) to exclude ecclesiastics from either or both houses of Congress and all civil employments; (2) to establish or destroy religious orders, and to dispose of the property of those destroyed; (3) to declare, define and limit papal control over the Mexican clergy and people; (4) to remove or destroy ecclesiastical abuses; (5) to fix the salaries of the clergy; (6) to annul or prohibit excommunication or other ecclesiastical censures. To the Chief Executive, with the advice and consent of the Senate, he would give the power to "nominate the Archbishops, and bishops, and present for all dignitaries and benefices of the cathedral, parochial and other churches, conformably to the laws." Furthermore, to the Chief Executive, with the consent of Congress, he would give the power to permit or prohibit the publication of papal bulls and the decrees of councils.[44]

In 1833 Austin was delegated to go to Mexico City to petition the Federal Government for a separate statehood for Texas. On his arrival there he found political affairs in a critical state. And, losing all hope of the success of his mission, he wrote to the municipality of Bexar to head the movement for "A state of Texas." This letter fell into the hands of Mexican officials who interpreted its contents as treasonable; consequently, they had Austin arrested.[45] An excerpt from his prison journal reveals his intense hatred of the Roman hierarchy. After reading a biography of Philip II of Spain he wrote in his diary:

[43] Austin to J. E. B. Austin, May 20, 1823. *Austin Papers*, Vol. II, Part I, 644-645.

[44] Austin, Stephen F., "Project of a Constitution for the Republic of Mexico", March 29, 1823. *Austin Papers*, Vol. II, Part I, 601-627.

[45] Yoakum, I, 312-315.

He was a blind, obedient and faithful servant of Rome—that mother of executioners, assassins, robbers, and tyrants who have desolated the civilized world, filling it with mourning, terror, and ruin, and degrading mankind far below the level of brutes. . . . People of Mexico! can you throw a glance at the history of Rome without feeling a pity for your ancestors, and without shaking off at once that religious yoke which has held, and to this day holds you enslaved? [46]

In 1834 anti-Catholic hostility became somewhat different in character; for then it received government support. In 1833 Santa Anna became president of the Mexican Republic and his political supporters advocated the subordination of the military and ecclesiastical authorities to civil jurisdiction.[47] Therefore, in conformity with the sentiments of the administration the legislature of the State of Coahuila and Texas issued in 1834 a number of decrees which encroached on the rights of the church: [48]

Decree No. 263: Article 2: The founding of edifices built by charitable donation (obras pias) under any denomination whatever is hereby absolutely prohibited.

Decree No. 263: Article 6: No person shall dispose of more than one-tenth of the fifth of his property in benefit of his soul.

Decree No. 263: Article 8: The intervention of ecclesiastical authority in affairs purely civil is hereby prohibited, also the testament visit in the state by the Bishops of diocess (sic).

Another decree forbade the publication of pastorals, edicts, and other ecclesiastical documents without the permission of the civil authorities: [49]

Decree No. 276: Article I: Pastorals, edicts, or orders transmitted by prelates of the diocess (sic) to towns of private individuals, as well as letters of obedience and decrees from the reverend spiritual governors of the different religious orders to those persons under their authority, who reside in the state, shall not be fulfilled therein without the corresponding permit to be granted by the executive, with the

[46] "Prison Journals of Stephen F. Austin", *The Texas State Historical Association*, Vol. II, 202-203.

[47] Garrison, 105-106.

[48] Gammel, I, 350-351.

[49] Gammel, I, 363-364.

knowledge of congress, and during the recess thereof, of the standing deputation.

Article 2: Disciplinary orders, private subjects pertaining to penitence immunity, and those which the public decorum require should be private, are hereby excepted from the provision of the preceding article.

Article 3: Curates, prelates, vicars, and others to whom the documents mentioned in Article 1, are directed, on reception thereof, shall present them to the executive that he may transmit them immediately to congress or the standing deputation. In case of contravention on the part of curates, they shall be banished from the state for the term of two years, and rejected from their benefice; and should it be on the part of the others, they shall incur the said banishment.

Article 4: Persons who print or reprint the edicts, etc., prohibited in Article I, shall be tried in conformity to the laws relative to the liberty of the press.

For its fulfillment, the Governor of the State shall cause it to be printed, published, and circulated.

Furthermore, a land law of the State of Coahuila and Texas, passed March 26, 1834, contained an article which stated that "No person shall be molested for political and religious opinions, provided he shall not disturb the public order." [50] The primary purpose of this article was to stimulate land sales; but at the same time it legalized Protestantism in Texas.[51] Moreover, even before the passage of this land act, Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian preachers had been cautiously exercising their ministry there.[52]

Notwithstanding these facts, after 1835 we meet with frequent allegations of the intolerance of the Catholic Church At San Felipe De Austin, December 8, 1835, the committee of the council on military affairs—Wyatt Hanks, J. D. Clement and R. R. Royal—presented a report which stated that "if we receive the assistance from the United States, which we may reasonably expect from the evidence already given us, we shall be able to shake off the shackles which tyrants and religious bigotry have attempted to bind us with. Santa Anna, the priest, the enemies of constutional liberty, throughout Mexico, will tremble when they learn that the blood

[50] Gammel, I, 358.
[51] Barker, *Life of Austin*, 260-261.
[52] Yoakum, II, 532-543.

and treasures of thousands of descendants of that patriotic band of heroes, who triumphed over England in the days of her strength and pride, have been tendered us in our present struggle for liberty and free institutions." [53]

In the introduction to the preamble, and in the preamble itself, of the Declaration of Independence, of the Republic of Texas, the alleged intolerance of the Church was again strongly emphasized. The introduction to the preamble stated that "every interest is disregarded but that of the army, and the priesthood—both the eternal enemies of civil liberty, the ever ready minions of power, and the usual instruments of tyrants." The preamble itself declared that there was left but one alternative—"either to abandon our homes, acquired by so many privations, or submit to the most intolerable of all tyranny, the combined despotism of the sword and the priesthood." It further maintained that the Government denied them "the right of worshipping the Almighty" according to the dictates of their own conscience, "by the support of a national religion calculated to promote the temporal interests of its human functionaries, rather than the glory of the true and living God." [54]

Moreover, in their appeal for foreign aid the leaders of the revolution depicted the war, which was about to begin, as a crusade for religious freedom. A circular issued by the commissioners of Texas soliciting volunteers from the United States bore on its first page a vignette representing Hercules attacking the Hydra; on each side of this was the coat of arms of the United States, and below it was the title: "Liberty triumphing over Tyranny and Priestcraft." [55]

Again, Austin and Archer jointly wrote to Colonel T. D. Owings of Kentucky, late of the United States infantry, and stated that their cause was "that of Liberty, Religious toleration and Freedom of Conscience against Usurpation, Despotism, and the Unnatural and Unholy Monopolies of the Church of Rome." [56]

[53] Texas; *Journal of the Central Council* of 1835, 123-124.

[54] "Declaration of Independence", Holley, Mrs. Mary Austin, *Texas*, 235-241.

[55] Garrison, *Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas*, II, Part 1, 69.

[56] Austin and Archer to Owings, Jan. 18, 1836, in Garrison, *Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas*, Vol. II, Part I, 60.

Summary

An attempt has been made in this chapter to describe the manifestations of Nativism in Texas prior to 1836. From the first, racial antagonism played a large part in the development of nativistic sentiment. The American was too far removed from the Mexican in character and traditions to view with sympathy the attitude of the latter toward political life and institutions, the maintenance of a State religion, and the existence of slavery—a question already vital to the American settlers. Evidences of hostility to the Catholic Church and the Catholic religion were not wanting. This hostile sentiment became active especially in 1834 and 1835, but it was now destined to disappear temporarily at least in the larger issue of the Texas Revolution.

CHAPTER III

Nativism in the Texas Republic, 1836-1845

The convention which adopted the declaration of independence and framed the constitution for the new republic assembled at Washington on the Brazos, March 1, 1836. Records of the debates which took place are unavailable, but direct evidence of hostility to foreigners on the part of its members is found in the tenth section of the constitution which forbade aliens to hold hand in Texas in any other way than "by titles emanating directly from the government of the republic." [1]

The first Congress held in 1837 reiterated these hostile sentiments by passing two anti-alien acts. The first forbade the holding of land by immigrants; [2] the second, the appointment of foreigners to any civil office except "consults to foreign ports," or to any military office, unless in case of invasion or the prosecution of an offensive war against Mexico. [3]

However, this period of foreign hostility was of short duration. The Republic, needing immigrants to colonize its unsettled lands and men available for military service in case of a Mexican invasion, passed, June 4, 1838, a law which abrogated the land act of 1837 by permitting all free white persons who had immigrated to Texas after October 1, 1837, and those who might immigrate thereto prior to January 1, 1840, to obtain a grant of land upon the conditions that they would reside permanently within the republic for a period of three years, and during that time perform all the duties required of citizens. [4] Moreover, colonization companies and individuals from the United States, England, Germany, France, and Belgium applied to the Government for information concerning contracts and the mode of settlements. [5]

[1] *Constitution of the Republic of Texas*, 18.

[2] Gammel, I, 264.

[3] Gammel, I, 61.

[4] Gammel, II, 35-36.

[5] December 10, 1838, John Burdgess, an Englishman, who had travelled extensively in Canada, United States and Texas wrote to President Lamar

Such widespread and growing interest in the colonization of the young republic reacted on the government, and "An Act Granting Land to Emigrants" was passed, January 4, 1841. It offered to every free white man who was the head of a family, and who had immigrated to Texas after January 1, 1840, or who should immigrate thereto before January 1, 1842, 640 acres of land, provided he would reside on the land for a term of three years and cultivate not less than ten acres. Under similar conditions any single free white person over seventeen years of age was entitled to 320 acres. Furthermore, the President was authorized to enter into a contract with one W. S. Peters and others for the introduction of a certain number of families.[6]

The Act authorized the President to designate certain limits of territory within which the immigrants were to reside. Not more than 640 acres were to be given to one family, or 320 acres to any single man over seventeen years of age. No agreement between a contractor and a family or between a contractor and an individual was to be binding if it should allow the contractor for transportation and other expenses more than one-half of the land to which said persons were entitled. The contractor was to receive 10 sections of land for every 100 families introduced, and 10 half-sections for every 100 single men brought in. One-third of the whole number of families and single persons provided for in the contract were to be introduced before the expira-

proposing to introduce 2000 families from Scotland.—*Lamar Papers*, II, 328.

February 22, 1839, T. Frontin, President of a German Association consisting of one hundred and fifty persons, wrote to President Lamar seeking information concerning settlement in Texas.—*Lamar Papers*, II, 460.

May 24, 1839, Charles Guillot, a Frenchman, asked President Lamar for a contract under which he might bring a number of French families.—*Lamar Papers*, III, 588.

September 17, 1839, L. Harper, a native of France, asked for a location favorable to commerce to settle a number of French families.—*Lamar Papers*, III, 110.

June 28, 1840, J. Adamson, an Englishman, wrote concerning the immense number of applications made to him by farmers and mechanics who were anxious to emigrate to Texas.—*Lamar Papers*, III, 415.

[6] Gammel, II, 554-557.

tion of one year from the date of the contract, otherwise it was liable to forfeiture. But a failure on the part of a contractor to fulfill his obligations would not deprive the colonists, already in the country, of their rights and quotas of land.[7]

February 5, 1842, this colonization law was supplemented by another which gave the President the power to make contracts with any colonizing company approved by him.[8]

Since to bring colonists to Texas it was necessary to notify the prospective emigrant of the existence of these laws, pamphlets and books were published[9] and circulated throughout Europe and the United States. In general, this literature contained summaries of the colonization laws, and a vast amount of information about Texas—its people, soil, mountains, rivers, harbors, towns, advantages of climate, a list of the products characteristic of each section, and hints to immigrants advising them as to the route to take, and the place to settle.

The contracts[10] made in accordance with these colonization

[7] Gammel, II, 554-557.

[8] Gammel, II, 785-786.

[9] Among these books may be mentioned: Hunt and Randel, *Guide to the Republic of Texas*, New York, 1839; Ikin, Arthur, *Texas, Its History, Topography, Agriculture, Commerce and General Statistics*, London, 1841; *Moore, Francis, Map and Description of Texas*, Philadelphia, 1841; Scherpf, G. A., *Entstehungsgeschichte und gegenwärtiger Zustand des neuen unabhangigen amerikanischen staats*, Augsburg, 1841; Sealsfield, *Das Kajütenbuch, oder Schilderungen aus dem Leben in Texas*, Zürich, 1841.

[10] Typical contracts: August 30, 1841, with W. S. Peters and others collectively to introduce 600 families within three years; and November 9, 1841, a second contract to bring in 200 additional families.

February 15, 1842, with Henry Castro and his associates for the introduction of 600 European families with permission to increase the number to 1000.

February 15, 1842, with William Kennedy and William Pringle to introduce 600 European families with the privilege of increasing the number to 1,000.

June 3, 1842, with Alexander Bourgeois and Armand Ducos for the settlement of 1200 European families or single men with the privilege of increasing the number to 1600.

June 7, 1842, with Henry Fisher and Burchard Miller for the settlement of 600 European families with permission to increase the number.

laws seem to have appealed to the prospective European emigrant, for in 1842 arrangements were in progress in France, England, and Germany for the emigration of large numbers of families from these countries to Texas.[11]

However, judging from comments in the Texas newspapers, the number of immigrants that reached Texas was comparatively small. In 1843 notice was taken of the "immense number of Europeans" who were settling in Wisconsin, Iowa, Missouri, Arkansas, and other western states and territories; while few were seeking homes in Texas. "With the exception of a few solitary adventurers and a few French and German families," it was said, that scarcely any immigrants had arrived in Texas in 1842.[12] This small number of immigrants was attributed to the information circulated in foreign countries regarding the warlike attitude of the Mexican Government and the repeated inroads of the Mexican soldiery.[13] Nevertheless, in 1843 immigration both from the United States and from Europe began steadily to increase. Large numbers from Missouri, Illinois, and Alabama were said to be settling in Northern and Eastern Texas.[14] January, 1843, 117 immigrants from Europe were reported as having arrived at Galveston,[15] while in February, 60 German families arrived.[16] Moreover, the *Weser Zeitung* in 1843, announced the departure from Bremen for New Orleans of 3,281 passengers, and stated that a large number of these were supposed to have gone to Texas.[17]

Coincident with the arrival of large numbers of immigrants from Europe was the condemnation of the contract system of colonization and the revival of hostility to the foreigner from

November 18, 1842, with Victor Pierson of Belgium and his associates for the bringing in of 1000 European families or single men.—MSS. Colonization Papers.

[11] *Telegraph and Texas Register*, Feb. 16, 1846.

[12] *Telegraph and Texas Register*, Aug. 30, 1843.

[13] *Telegraph and Texas Register*, Aug. 30, 1843.

[14] *Telegraph and Texas Register*, April 12, 1843.

[15] *Civilian and Galveston Gazette*, Jan. 7, 1843.

[16] *Telegraph and Texas Register*, Feb. 1, 1845.

[17] Benjamin, 57.

Europe. We have definite evidence of this in the annual report for 1843, of Thos. Wm. Ward, Commissioner of the General Land Office:

The law granting lands to emigrants approved Jan. 4th, 1841 and the amendatory law thereto of the 6th Congress are illegal, impolitic, and objectionable on several grounds. . . . The lands in this country constitute the principal wealth of most of its inhabitants; upon the value of them they have founded their hopes of success. The government of this country has encouraged this hope, and it would therefore be the greatest injustice for it now to preclude emigrants from the United States from locating their claims on our frontiers; to give these lands to crowds of foreigners who never shared in our struggle for independence, and who came to this country from mercenary motives only, and send our own citizens to the Comanche and Buffalo ranges to select lands, . . . Every Texian now within our borders feels a greater interest in this country than the foreigners to be introduced under these contracts can possibly be brought to feel, and future events may prove that the best policy of our government, would have been not to have lessened this feeling by giving to foreigners the reward due to our countrymen and they who have proved themselves in the hour of need. . . .[18]

This report attracted the attention of the Congress of Texas, for in December, 1843, "An Act to repeal all laws now in force authorizing the President to form colonization contracts, and to forfeit such as have already been made, where the conditions have not been strictly complied with," was introduced. After passing both Houses, it was sent to the President for his signature. President Houston vetoed the bill, and through his private secretary, W. D. Miller, returned it to the Senate with the message cited:

The various contracts under the laws intended to be repealed by the bill, were all made with reference to those laws as they stood at the date of the contracts. Those laws contemplate and provide for an extension of time, under certain circumstances, to the contractors. This provision entered into and became one of the governing principles of the contracts; and any law now passed declaring that no extension of

[18] The Report as read in the debates in the Constitutional Convention of 1845, 603-610.

time or privilege shall be granted to said contractors for the purpose of carrying such contracts into effect, would in the opinion of the Executive, directly impair the obligation of the existing contracts. The contractors have the right to expect a just and strict compliance with the spirit and letter of the laws governing their contracts, on the part of the Government; and to curtail their rights as provided for in the bill, would, the Executive conceives, be not only a violation of the Constitution but work great loss and inconvenience to those who have invested capital and expended labor in endeavoring to carry out their respective undertaking in good faith.

In one or two instances, contractors have been prevented from introducing settlers into their colonies, by the express request and direction of the Government, under the apprehension that by so doing, the efforts of the Government in bringing about a peace with the Indians would probably be interrupted. Under these circumstances it would be a glaring violation of good faith to deprive the contractors of the privileges secured to them under the law. . . .

The Executive is assured from many sources, both in Europe and America, that many emigrants are already on their way to the colonies to be settled under existing contracts; many have already arrived, and many more will (unless all faith in the Government is destroyed) make our vacant territory their future home. A very powerful and wealthy association at Mayence, in Germany, is on the eve of commencing the introduction of a large number of German families into Western Texas. By affording a few facilities and observing a strict regard for the laws, much may be done towards the settlement and protection of that portion of our vacant territory by a population distinguished for its industry and thrift.[19]

This message failed in its purpose, for the bill was again taken up in the Senate, January 25, 1844, and passed by a vote of 9 to 3,[20] and in the House, January 30, 1844, the bill was passed over the President's veto by a vote of 35 to 3.[21]

These indications of hostility grew more evident as the year progressed. Immigration from the United States was then on the decline. For a considerable time middle and western Texas had been receiving only European immigrants.[22]

[19] *Senate Journals of the Republic of Texas*, VII-IX Congresses, 99-100.
[20] *Senate Journals of the Republic of Texas*, VII-IX Congresses, 172.
[21] *House Journals of the Republic of Texas*, VIII Congress, 391.
[22] *Telegraph and Texas Register*, Nov. 6, 1844.

The arrival in 1844 of several hundred families from Europe and the rumor afloat that several thousand were to follow aroused in the American element sentiments of hostility to the foreigner, for the former read into this rising tide of immigration, a danger to the existence of slavery.[23] But the advocates of foreign immigration while admitting the possibility of the abolition of slavery as a remote eventuality, strongly emphasized the inexpediency of any attempt to check immigration from Europe. They reasoned that if Texas should be annexed to the United States, the laws of that Republic relative to naturalization, *i. e.*, a period of five years would then prevail, and the influx of immigrants from the United States would exceed that from Europe, and, as a consequence, the political power of the foreigner[24] would be counteracted. On the other hand, they maintained, that if the annexation of Texas should not become an actuality, United States citizens would probably not emigrate to Texas since so many opportunities were afforded them in the new states of the West, and as a result Texas would have to rely on Europe as the only possible source from which to draw a population.[25] Texas, they asserted, needed capital at least in industry if not in money.[26]

The nativism of this period is well reflected in the debates of the Constitutional Convention of 1845. In accordance with the recommendations of the President of the Republic this assembly held its first formal meeting in the City of Austin, July 4, for the purpose of framing a state constitution preparatory to the annexation of Texas to the United States.[27]

Only one of the members of this convention was a native of Texas; the others were all immigrants. Of these Tennessee contributed eighteen members; Virginia, eight; Georgia, seven; Kentucky, six; North Carolina, five; South Carolina, three; Pennsyl-

[23] *Telegraph and Texas Register*, Jan. 22, 1845.

[24] Under the Constitution of the Republic of Texas, all persons residing in Texas on the day of the declaration of independence, and persons who might thereafter emigrate, reside six months, and then take the oath of allegiance, were made citizens.

[25] *Telegraph and Texas Register*, Jan. 22, 1845.

[26] *Telegraph and Texas Register*, Jan. 22, 1845.

[27] *Journal of the Convention of* 1845, 3.

vania, two; Massachusetts, two; Louisiana, two; Maine, two; Alabama, one; Ohio, one; New York, one; Texas, one; and Ireland, one.[28]

Most of these men had been residing in Texas since 1835; however, almost all of them were familiar with the functionings of the United States government and with that of their native states. Hence, delegates mentioned from time to time provisions existing in constitutions elsewhere. Nevertheless, they drew most frequently upon the Constitution of the Republic of Texas, in the drawing up of which some of them had participated. However, frequent references were made to the Louisiana Constitution which had been recently revised, and which was permeated with nativistic sentiments. Towards the close of the Convention Rusk asserted that he "sincerely wished that the future constitution of Louisiana had remained up" until the Texas Convention had finished its labors. "We have received no benefit from it," he said, "and have come very near incorporating some articles which would have been ruinous to Texas.[29]

At the opening of this Convention, H. G. Runnels nominated Thos. J. Rusk for president, and since there was no other nominee for the office, he was declared "duly and unanimously elected." [30] The President of the Convention then appointed six standing committees: (1) on the state of the nation; (2) executive; (3) on legislative; (4) on general provisions of the constitution; (5) judiciary; and (6) on printing.[31] The first evidence of nativism in this Assembly is found in the committee report on the Executive. It limited the gubernatorial office to native citizens of the United States and to citizens "of the State of Texas, at the time of the adoption of this Constitution." [32] In the Committee of the whole on the Executive Department, James Scott, of Montgomery, moved to strike out the word "native." [33] This motion gave rise to a debate during which James Davis, of Liberty, said that the Committee was willing to accord to adopted citizens all the privileges of all other citizens, but that in regard to state offices they

[28] Journal, 377.
[29] Debates, 468.
[30] Journal, 5.
[31] Journal, 17.
[32] Journal, 36.
[33] Debates, 108.

entertained the opinion that the governor should be taken from among the native-born citizens of the United States. He declared that he, too, was willing to consider adopted citizens eligible for any other office, except the governorship; the latter office he would intrust to none save those reared under American institutions.[34]

R. E. B. Baylor, of Fayette, reminded the Convention that the retention of the word "native" might bring this section of the State Constitution into conflict with Article IV, Section 2, (1) of the United States Constitution which states that "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states." He said that, with the exception of the presidency, a foreigner in the United States, complying with all the provisions of the naturalization laws, was entitled to all the "immunities, rights and privileges" of any other citizen in the United States; and that if the Convention should exclude him from the governorship of the State, it would, as far as that office was concerned, place him on an inequality with other citizens of the United States, and that, therefore, such a restriction embodied in the state Constitution, would be in direct conflict with the aforesaid article.[35]

The word "native" was stricken out,[36] but when the report of the Executive Committee was again taken up in the Convention, J. L. Hogg, of Nacogdoches, moved to limit the governorship to native-born citizens. The proposal was tabled by a vote of 50 to 5.[37]

July 11, H. G. Runnels, chairman of the Committee on the legislative department, made a report, the first section of which read thus:

> Every free white male person who shall be a citizen of the United States, or who is, at the time of the adoption of this Constitution, a citizen of the now Republic of Texas, and shall have resided in this State one year next preceding an election, and the last six months within the county, city, or town in which he offers to vote (Indians not taxed. Africans and descendants of Africans excepted) shall be deemed a qualified elector.[38]

[34] Debates, 108.
[35] Debates, 109.
[36] Debates, 110.
[37] Journal, 137.
[38] Journal, 54.

This report gave rise to heated discussion in which strong nativistic tendencies were revealed, and G. A. Everts offered the following as a substitute for this section:

> Every free male person, who shall be a bona fide inhabitant of Texas, at the time of the adoption of this Constitution by the Congress of the United States, and who shall have attained the age of twenty-one years, (Indians, Africans and descendants of Africans excepted), shall be deemed a qualified elector; and thereafter, all free male persons, who shall be citizens of the United States, and who shall have resided in this State one year next preceding the day of election, and who shall have attained to the age of twenty-one years, * * * shall be entitled to vote in the county in which they shall reside. . . .[39]

This was not adopted.

In the committee of the whole one of the first amendments recommended was to strike out the word "white" in line one. The delegates from West Texas objected to its use in describing the electorate, for they believed that the Committee intentionally inserted it to disfranchise the Mexican. J. A. Navarro, speaking through his interpreter, said that "if the word white means anything at all, it means a great deal, and if it does not mean anything at all it is entirely superfluous, as well as odious, and, if you please, ridiculous." [40]

Various other substitutes and amendments were proposed; some including, and other excluding the alien as a qualified voter; however, none of them carried, and at G. W. Brown's suggestion, the matter was referred to a special committee.[41] The latter's report dealt with the subject under two headings: the extension of the right of citizenship and the qualifications of electors. In its introduction it stated that "from the general aspect of some of the amendments, it seems intended to obtain from the Convention, a declaration to be inserted somewhere in the Constitution, that a class of persons, who, under the existing Constitution, and in view of the period when that Constitution will be superseded by another, will probably never become citizens of this Republic, should be made such by the ratification of the Constitution by the people." [42]

[39] Journal, 211.
[40] Debates, 159.
[41] Journal, 216.
[42] Journal, 235.

Treating of the extension of citizenship it declared that, since the Constitution of the Republic of Texas would continue in force until the Republic yielded its sovereignty to the United States, all who were or might become citizens of the Republic of Texas by the operation of said Constitution would become citizens of the United States at the time of annexation, and that the latter would be bound to accept them with all the privileges they had acquired when the United States made its overture. But it doubted the fact as to whether the United States would acquiesce in a further extension of citizenship not in accordance with the requirements of the Constitution. Furthermore, it declared that naturalization is a contract to which the consent of both parties is an essential element, and that no governmental declarations could make a citizen without the alien's consent. Consequently, the report maintained that it was both "inexpedient and unsafe" to attempt any greater enlargement of the rights of the alien in this respect; but it made recommendations granting him the substantial rights of citizenship. It suggested that "all free male persons, aged twenty-one years and upwards, (Indians not taxed, Africans and descendants of Africans excepted) who, previous to the adoption of this Constitution by the Congress of the United States, were residents of the Republic of Texas, should be qualified electors in the county in which they may reside." [43]

This having failed, James Love, of Galveston, offered a substitute in which he proposed to limit qualified electors to those who were citizens of Texas at the time of the adoption of the Constitution by the Congress of the United States; but he inserted a section granting to the State Legislature the right to make provisions by law for the manner in which foreigners arriving in the State, after its adoption as one of the United States, (and who had not been naturalized under the laws of the United States) should exercise the right of suffrage in all elections for state officers.[44] The substitute was adopted, but the clause making provision for the enfranchisement of the foreigner was, at the suggestion of T. J. Rusk, stricken out.[45]

[43] Journal, 235-238.

[44] Journal, 248.

[45] Journal, 248-249.

However, the friends of the foreign element not being satisfied, J. S. Mayfield offered a substitute for that of Love's. It provided that free male persons who were *bona fide* inhabitants of Texas at the time of the adoption of the Constitution by the people of the State, or at its acceptance by Congress should be deemed qualified voters. This motion was rejected by a vote of 42 to 13.[46]

Another substitute proposed by Isaac Van Zandt, of Harrison, would bestow the right of suffrage upon aliens who were actual residents and inhabitants of Texas, at the time of the approval of the State Constitution by the Congress of the United States. This proposal was also rejected by a vote of 37 to 17.[47]

Finally, the President of the Convention, T. J. Rusk, offered a substitute for that of Love's. According to it, every free male person of the age of twenty-one years and upwards, residing in Texas at the date of the adoption of the Constitution, would have the right to vote at the first election held under the new Constitution; but after that election only citizens of the United States who had resided in Texas twelve months would enjoy that right.[48]

James Love, protesting against the adoption of this substitute, stated that he wished the rule to be adopted that any person who might be in Texas at the time of the acceptance of the Constitution by the United States should have the right to vote. Furthermore, he said that he should like to see Europeans enjoying the same rights as were accorded to the citizens of the United States. He maintained that the latter were foreigners to the Texans, just as much as the Englishman, the German or the Russian was. He suggested placing all persons who should be "actually" in Texas at the time of the adoption of the state Constitution upon the same footing.[49]

Van Zandt, while militating against the adoption of Rusk's substitute because it excluded the alien as a qualified voter, expressed heretical tenets on the effect of annexation on the citizenry of Texas of European birth. According to his declarations, the very act of annexation would make them aliens in the country where formerly they were citizens, and moreover, having renounced allegiance

[46] Journal, 248-249.
[47] Journal, 249.
[48] Debates, 574-575.
[49] Debates, 574.

to their native land to become citizens of Texas, it would make them aliens to the world. In support of his doctrine, he argued that the treaty made with France in 1803 provided that those who were citizens of Louisiana, or subjects of that government should at the "earliest day practicable" be admitted to all the rights of citizens of the United States, and should "in the meantime," be protected in person and property. The term, meantime, he declared, evidently contemplated a period between the admission of that section to the Union and the admission of its inhabitants to the rights of citizenship. Furthermore, he maintained that the Constitution of the United States gave Congress the power to pass uniform laws of naturalization, and that the treaties for the acquisition of Louisiana and Florida were not made by Congress, but by the President and the Senate, and that, such treaties would be unconstitutional if they attempted to make the people of the said territories naturalized citizens. Accordingly, he maintained that as the treaties of 1803 and 1819 did not make the inhabitants of the territories in question citizens, so neither would annexation make all the citizens of the Republic of Texas, citizens of the United States. Only those who were formerly citizens of the United States and the native Texans—through the extension of the laws of the United States over their country—would be made citizens of the United States.[50]

Rusk proved the fallaciousness of this argument by showing that the United States, in the matter of annexation was dealing not with the individuals living in Texas, but with Texas, as a separate, distinct, and sovereign government, and that on entering the Union, Texas was going in as a Community—the inhabitants retaining all the rights which they had possessed as citizens of the Republic.[51]

Following this debate, a vote was taken on the adoption of Rusk's substitute, and it was carried by a majority of three.[52] Then, John Caldwell, of Bastrop, offered an amendment which proposed that "at the first and all subsequent elections held under the Constitution, all male emigrants to the Republic of Texas,

[50] Debates, 576-577.
[51] Debates, 576-577.
[52] Debates, 582.

of the age of twenty-one years, at the time of the acceptance of this Constitution by the Congress of the United States, shall be deemed a qualified voter after a residence of six months." In introducing the amendment, he said that it was intended "to cover the case" of those who might have immigrated to Texas in good faith, and who would have been entitled under the laws of the Republic to hold lands and enjoy all the rights of citizenship after a residence of six months. He maintained that he considered the denial of these rights under the new Constitution a hardship which the Convention had no right to impose on the foreigners.[53]

John Hemphill, of Washington, speaking in favor of Caldwell's amendment, favored giving those who arrived in Texas previous to the adoption of the State constitution, the right to vote and own land, but not the right to hold office before they became citizens of the United States through naturalization. However, he was not in favor of extending the right of suffrage to any foreigner from Europe after the adoption of the Constitution by the United States, because he feared that, if political power were bestowed on the foreigner, he might eventually control the elections.[54]

W. B. Ochiltree, of Nacogdoches, considered the amendment a dangerous one. He stated that if the constitution should be adopted by January 1, 1846, according to the provisions of the amendment, a foreigner arriving in Texas, December 31, 1845, would be entitled to vote, whereas an American citizen arriving on the following day would not be permitted to vote until after a residence of twelve months; and that 3500 Germans arriving in Texas, December 31, would immediately enjoy all the privileges of citizens, while 500 citizens from Kentucky or Tennessee entering Texas January 2, would be denied the power of franchise for twelve months. He objected to the bestowal of political power on the foreigner, until he should have served the required probation period.[55]

In order to augment the hostility to the foreigner, Ochiltree called on the clerk to read an abstract from the *Picayune* which stated that a colony of 15,000 Swiss were about to leave their homes to settle in Texas.[56] To counteract the ill effects of this information, Caldwell read another excerpt which stated that 20,-

[53] Debates, 588-589.
[54] Debates, 589.
[55] Debates, 589.
[56] Debates, 590.

000 people were preparing to immigrate to Texas from Kentucky and Tennessee.[57]

L. D. Evans, of Fannin, anxious to adopt a clause in the Constitution saving the rights of foreigners then in Texas, as well as of those who might immigrate hither before the acceptance of the Constitution, declared that he had no fear for the difficulties which Rusk seemed to anticipate from foreign immigration; and that he had never seen a German, Irishman or Scotchman who was not as good a Republican as any member of the Convention.[58] A vote was now taken on the Caldwell amendment; it was defeated by 32 to 21.[59] The discussion of this crucial question was finally brought to a close by the adoption of an additional section to be inserted after section one. It granted to foreigners, who had resided in Texas six months previous to the acceptance of this Constitution by the Congress of the United States, the right to vote.[60]

The thirtieth section of the report of the Committee on the legislative department, apportioning representation among "the several counties, cities or towns which were entitled to separate representation, according to the number of qualified electors in each," was taken up July 23, in the Committee of the whole for further consideration. The proposal made by J. M. Lewis, of Montgomery, to strike out "qualified electors" and insert "free white population" or "free population" was debated at length.[61] These debates not only revealed the existence of sectional jealousy between east and west Texas, but they were also indicative of strong nativist tendencies on the part of the slave-holding American element in the East, toward the non-slave holding and largely non-American element in the West. The amendment was seemingly proposed on the ground that property as well as population should be considered in apportioning representation. Two of the outstanding opponents of the proposed measure were James Love, of Galveston, and F. J. Moore, of Harris. The former maintained that since taxation and representation must be equal, the Convention would violate every principle of a Republican form of

[57] Debates, 590.
[58] Debates, 590-591.
[59] Journal, 255.
[60] Journal, 255.
[61] Journal, 99; Debates, 201-205.

government, if it should adopt the amendment and that the adoption of this measure would exclude the large plantation section of the country, which was, and would continue to be, the largest tax-paying portion of the State from its due weight in representation; furthermore, it would unduly increase the representation of districts paying less tax. The latter maintained that within fifteen years slavery would be abolished by popular vote if it was not protected by "some checks or balances," for the East contained the slaveholding, and the West, the free population.[62]

Moreover, Moore asserted that it was not the European he feared, but the Mexican. He said:

> Strike out the term white and what will be the result? Hordes of Mexican Indians may come in here from the West, and may be more formidable than the enemy you have vanquished. Silently they will come moving in: they will come back in thousands to Bexar, in thousands to Goliad, perhaps to Nacogdoches, and what will be the consequence? Ten, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty thousand may come in here, and vanquish you at the ballot box. . . . We have received recent information from the West, that large numbers are now on their way to Texas, intending soon to settle at Bexar.[63]

Exhibiting his hostility towards the Mexican Indian he continued:

> I fear not the Castilian race, but . . . those who, though they speak the Spanish language, are but the descendants of that degraded and despicable race which Cortez conquered. They, if we adopt the amendment, will have a representation equal to that of the Anglo-Saxon or European races.[64]

In another debate on this same section, Moore reported that he was opposed to all property representation such as cattle, lands, or money, but if the members of the Convention should deem it necessary for the preservation of the peculiar institutions of Texas to insert such a provision in the Constitution, he would willingly acquiesce, and would even consent to the adoption of all free white inhabitants plus three-fifths of the negro population as a basis for representation. Commenting on the peculiar location of Texas he said:

[62] Debates, 202-217.
[63] Debates, 235-236.
[64] *Ibid.*, 235-236.

Westward of the Rio Grande, there are haciendas having no less than three thousand peons, directed and controlled by one man residing in the City of Mexico. I would ask if there is no reason to fear them, when they may be driven up like sheep to the ballot box. I have been informed that at one of the precincts at San Patricio, some three or four hundred of these people were called upon to vote, and furnished with little bits of paper with something written upon them, and told to go and put them in the box. When they had voted, they asked what these bits of paper were put in for; . . . Is this democracy? . . . Democracy to be equal should be sustained by men equal in rights, and as nearly as possible equal in intelligence. But when an inferior race is brought to act with a superior, the rights of the superior, intelligent and enlightened portion are often controlled by a minority.[65]

J. M. Lewis, apprehending no dangers from the machinations of the non-slaveholding class in Texas, affirmed that the one great passion which dominated all classes in the Republic was the ambition to possess slaves, and that the purchase of slaves was usually a man's first investment, for that type of property was regarded more valuable than money. He declared that all his property outside of a piece of land consisted of slaves, and that, despite this fact, he considered it perfectly secure. But the proposition to make such property the basis of representation was to his mind the most abhorrent of doctrines, and one to which he would never consent.[66]

V. E. Howard, of Bexar, advocated the adoption of the amendment, for he considered it unjust that the immigrant during his five years' probation for citizenship would have neither his property nor his interest represented. He declared that he would make no attempt to defend the foreigners. However, in alluding to the prevailing distrust of them, he maintained that there was not a single instance on record in the Republic in which the Germans as a people had shown any disposition to interfere with slavery, and that those Germans among whom he lived were never disorganizers, never radicals; that they never attacked property; but, on the contrary, they were industrious, sober, frugal, and successful in acquiring property and identifying themselves with the soil and the institutions of the country, and that, therefore, he considered

[65] Debates, 242-243.

[66] Debates, 243-245.

the German entitled to some degree of representation.[67] On the motion of J. S. Mayfield, the problem of apportioning representation in the State Legislature was referred to a special committee by a vote of 31 to 26.[68] H. J. Jewett moved that the Committee consist of three members from the eastern, three from the western, and three from the middle regions of the country; this motion was carried, and, at the suggestion of T. J. Rusk, three members were added from the northern section.[69] The struggle which had been witnessed in the convention was renewed in the Committee. Anti-nativists contended for representation based on free population, and Nativists, for representation based on qualified electors. However, after three weeks' consultation, a majority of the Committee agreed to a compromise by which representation in the House was based upon free white population and in the Senate, upon the qualified electors.[70] Although this arrangement pleased neither section, it was finally adopted.[71]

The question as to whether the colonization contracts could be annulled came up in the convention and gave rise to a debate strongly colored with nativism. H. J. Jewett, an opponent of foreign colonization, attempting to prove that it was both just and expedient to suspend all the contracts, maintained that all those contracts made with the Government up to that time (1845) were forfeited, for, in no instance had the specified number of families been introduced, nor had protection been afforded the frontier. He declared that the disposition of lands according to the contract method was an act of injustice to the soldier, and to all who had land bounties granted them as a reward for their military service in the Revolution of 1836. Furthermore, he urged the advisability of cancelling all contracts so as to increase the residue of the public domain for the payment of the public debt. His concluding remarks reveal the motive which suggested the debate—he feared the abolitionism of the foreigner.[72]

G. A. Everts, an advocate of foreign colonization, briefly stated his reasons for voting against the cancellation of the contracts, and in this same debate proved the groundless assumption of their

[67] Debates, 240-241.
[68] Journal, 103-104.
[69] Journal, 104.
[70] Journal, 220-221.
[71] Journal, 240.
[72] Debates, 603-610.

unconstitutionality. He asserted that by virtue of the Revolution and the independence of Texas all the unappropriated lands within the Republic had become the property of the State; and that, therefore, the Government had the right to dispose of them as it saw fit. He maintained that the suspension of the colony contracts by the Constitutional convention "ex parte," would be an act in direct conflict with the Constitution of the United States which declared that no state should pass any law impairing the validity or obligation of a contract, and that, in consequence the Congress of the United States might, and with good reason, reject the Constitution.[73]

V. E. Howard, of Bexar, believing the question to be a judicial one, suggested that it be judicially examined. He alluded to the fact that the position taken by some of the members was clearly unfounded, since it was based on the ground that, in so far as there was a general lien upon the public lands for the payment of the soldiers and other public creditors, the grants of the contractors were unconstitutional. Furthermore, he added: "It is not pretended that there was any specific lien on the particular territory covered by these grants." As a proof of his assertion, he referred to the report of the General Land Office which showed that, after discharging all military claims, there would be left 180 millions of acres of public domain, which would be more than sufficient to discharge the public debt which had not been estimated above $10,000,000.[74]

He maintained that it was not the soldier, but the speculator that was clamoring for the destruction of these grants; that it was true that a large portion of the immigration to western Texas was European; but that the honest and laborious German had always been found a valuable citizen in every part of the Union; that his industry, his love of social order, and his attachment to American institutions were proverbial.[75]

The advocates of foreign immigration argued that the establishment of vast free labor communities in western Texas would be the consequence of carrying out the contract system, and that such a class of settlers was preferable to greedy land speculators.

[73] Debates, 615-616.
[74] Debates, 638-640.
[75] Debates, 645.

But James S. Mayfield, whose views were not in harmony with this class, said:

> By the operation of this system (contract system) what do these gentlemen build up? Do they build up an untrammelled class of free and independent population? No, . . . They create little principalities or dukedoms under the control of princes . . . This population has no intercourse with the great mass of the people . . . When these emigrants are settled, the petty duke or prince is their master.

Furthermore, he argued that if the contract system were allowed to continue the remote results would be a division of Texas into two or more states with equal and independent powers; and that the foreigners in these states would then demand that such states be free. He urged, moreover, that if foreigners were to be permitted to continue to settle in Texas, they should come as freemen, not as the serfs of any petty prince, duke, or company.[76]

However, after having been placed in the hands of a special committee, the subject was finally dismissed by the adoption of an ordinance which assigned to the Attorney-General of the State, or the District Attorney of the District in which any portion of the colonies might be situated, the duty to institute legal proceedings against all colony contractors who had entered into contracts with the President of Texas; and if, upon such investigation, it should be found that any contract was unconstitutional, illegal, or fraudulent, or that its provisions had not been fully complied with, it should be annulled. Actual settlers under such a contract would be entitled to their lands as colonists.[77]

The constitution of 1836 had contained a forfeiture clause directed against persons who should leave the country "to avoid war," or "refuse to participate in it," or "give aid or sustenance" to Mexico. Those members of the Convention who were hostile to the Mexicans made a strong attempt to carry this provision over into the State Constitution. Among the foremost opponents of the measure was T. J. Rusk. Speaking at length on the subject, he said:

> A set of Mexicans have taken up arms against us, and the whole

[76] Debates, 657-661.

[77] Journal, 293-297.

indignation of this Convention is aroused to punish them and enrich the treasury. Now there was a similar provision in the Constitution of 1836. Has the public treasury been enriched by these forfeitures? I attempted in my place in the Congress of 1837 to bring about a declaration upon the subject, but nobody would sustain me; I could not get these riches into the coffers of the country . . . I have never yet seen a dollar accrue to the government from this source; and I will further make the assertion that every dollar we shall ever derive from it will cost us five. . . .

In his characterization of the Mexican, he professed an acquaintance with his virtues and vices. Dwelling on the former, he said that, when the war signal was heard in 1836, almost every citizen in San Antonio, Goliad and Victoria turned out his cattle and sacrificed everything he possessed to support the army and in that way contributed "thousands upon thousands" of dollars, and he doubted if ever one dollar had been paid back. Furthermore, he claimed that many a Mexican fought in the rank and file of the revolutionary army, and that many of those who joined the enemy were forced to do so by the bold and renowned military chieftain, Santa Anna, who was in possession of their homes and country and who was then the arbiter of their lives and those of their families. "Will this convention, now in a time of peace and quiet," he said, "when the country is rejoicing in prosperity and about to enter the glorious American Union, descend from its high functions, to wreak the vengeance of the state upon these poor people?" "It strikes me," he continued, "that the provision in your constitution has a very limited application; there were but few there who could have forfeited their lands in 1836. We were obliged to drive them away, giving them the choice of places to which to remove. They deliberated upon it: if they went back to the interior settlements, they would have no way to make a living. Some chose to return back, and a great many perished; some went to Matamoras, and a great many of them were killed In truth, the whole western frontier presented, in 1835, a flourishing population, which was not then against us; all were in favor of civil liberty and religious toleration. What does that frontier present now? A scene of desolation, distress and degradation, brought about by war. And would it be chivalrous and generous

in us, to take advantage now of our power, and take away these lands, even supposing that they had been thus forfeited?" He also declared that the first thing Mexico would do when she would come to negotiate about limits would be to insist that these citizens who were forced to leave their homes during the revolution should not be deprived of their rights.[78]

A. C. Horton, of Matagorda, another opponent of the forfeiture clause, said that (1) the gentleman from the West stated that he issued an order in 1836 commanding the Mexicans to leave that section of the country; (2) in the spring of 1842 Colonel Owen in command of the Texan forces issued a similar peremptory order and (3) in the fall of the same year he, himself, at the instance of the President of the Republic gave an arbitrary command to the citizens living at Carlos' Rancho to remove immediately from that section. To the objections made by Carlos that he had been told that if he left the country his lands would be forfeited, Horton stated that he assured him that the law would not bear upon him because he was only complying with a peremptory order received from one who had authority to give it, and that unless he with all those living around him did remove he and they would be treated as an enemy of the country.[79]

A. S. Cunningham, of Victoria, while manifesting hostility towards the Mexicans, admitted the veracity of the statements made by Rusk and Horton, but he claimed that all the Mexicans of Victoria and Goliad were not at their homes when the order was given to leave these places and that some had joined the army of the enemy. "Why," he asked, "had they done so? Because they had taken up arms against the Republic of Texas; they had imbrued their hands in the blood of our people; they had perpetrated one of the most diabolical murders ever known in history. . . ."[80] (The allusion is to the massacre of Fannin's men.)

By a vote of 28 to 26 the section was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.[81] John Hemphill, Chairman of Committee, reported against the insertion of such a clause in the Constitution. The report stated that "The ordinary powers of legislation will authorize the adoption of the necessary means for the investigation

[78] Debates, 402-403.
[79] Debates, 407-408.
[80] Debates, 409-410.
[81] Journal, 168.

of this and other classes of forfeitures, and such disposition and appropriation of them as may be most conducive to the ends of public justice, and advancement of the common welfare." [82]

Although the Convention continued in session until August 28, the foregoing is the last debate in which nativism appeared.

Summary

An attempt has been made in this chapter to trace evidences of nativism from the Independence of Texas to its admission into the Union in 1845. In the earliest part of the period nativism was revealed in official enactments relative to land and the holding of office. Then followed an interval within which the Government of Texas, through the passage of generous colonization laws, invited foreigners from both the United States and Europe to settle within her boundaries. However, in 1843, coincident with a rising and steady stream of immigration from Europe, manifestations of hostility to the European appeared. These manifestations grew more pronounced in 1844, while in 1845, as we have seen, they became very evident in the debates in the Constitutional Convention. Furthermore, these same debates were indicative of the fundamental cause of the existence of nativism; that is, the European's being considered a standing menace to the existence of slavery. East and southeast Texas settled by immigrants from the Southern States were slavery sections; while the population of West Texas, made up largely of foreigners, was predominately free in sentiment. This gave rise to an issue which was about to effect a deep-seated cleavage between the racial elements and it was profoundly to affect the history of the State.

---

[82] Journal, 190.

CHAPTER IV

Texas Politics, 1845-1854

As a State Texas was rather slow in adapting itself to party alignment on national affairs. Aside from questions of territorial boundaries in which the people as a whole "concurred in the efforts of the State Government to assert and maintain," there were no political questions agitated in the State that were of such character as to bring about the formation of parties. Matters of local interest—internal improvements, the development of the resources of the State, and payment of the public debt—engaged the attention of the people.[1] Consequently, for some years after admission to the Union, there were no state conventions called by party organization, and the times and places for holding such as were held were arranged through informal expressions in the press.

Prior to 1855, due to this influence of the press, either annual or biennial attempts were unofficially made to organize the Democratic party. On April 27, 1846, a meeting of the members of the legislature and of other citizens from different sections of the State was held at the capitol for the purpose of appointing a Democratic central committee and devising means to organize the party throughout the State. The necessary committees were appointed, and suggestions made in regard to the time and place of holding a state convention.[2] But the breaking out of the Mexican War prevented the meeting of the convention and directed the attention of the Texans to more pressing matters.[3] A second attempt at Democratic organization was made in 1848. Those interested in the movement held a preliminary meeting at Austin on January 10, 1848. Here it was decided to call a state convention to meet at the Capitol on the third Monday in February to select delegates for the National Convention and to nominate presidential electors. In its strong appeal to the different counties to send delegates it discussed the attitude of

[1] Wooten, II, 35.
[2] Winkler, 18.
[3] Winkler, 18.

the national parties toward questions of vital interest in Texas.[4] The response was rather discouraging since only thirty-five counties were represented.[5]

The next noteworthy attempt at organization took place in 1852. The Taylor-Fillmore administration was not very popular in Texas; moreover, the growing sectional hostility due to the slavery issue tended to increase state-wide interest in national affairs.[6] Accordingly, the Texas press became more interested in political organization. For example, the *State Gazette,* September 13, 1851, published a series of press discussions on the subject of holding conventions. It stated that (1) the *Washington Ranger* proposed the holding of a convention, because in the last campaign the Whigs had supported a candidate for governor; (2) the *Galveston Journal* was urging the Whigs to organize; (3) the *Red-Land Herald* suggested the holding of a state convention on the first Monday in January; (4) the *San Antonio Ledger,* whilst consenting to the holding of a state convention for Federal affairs, held the opinion that the people of Texas did not desire party organization to be carried into the nomination of state and county officers as yet, and also expressed the belief that, since at least three-fourths of the people of Texas were Democrats, the executive and legislative departments of the government would remain in the hands of the Democrats for years to come without any strict party organization.[7]

[4] Winkler, *Political Platform,* 20, quoting *Texas Democrat,* Jan. 12, 1848, states:

The Whig party, . . . through its great leader, has sent forth its manifesto to the world, declaring in effect that the occupation of a portion of our State lying between the Nueces and the Rio Grande by the troops of the Union was a just cause on the part of Mexico for the present war, and also declaring in favor of a withdrawal of our troops from the scenes of their triumph and against any acquisition of territory as an indemnity for the expenses of the war.

The Democratic party, on the other hand, have (*sic*) declared the immediate cause of the war to have been the invasion of our soil and the murder of our citizens by the Mexican army, and they now insist on its vigorous prosecution until Mexico shall consent to make an honorable peace and suitable indemnity for former spoliations, and the expenses of the war that they have forced upon us by their repeated acts of aggression.

[5] Winkler, 20.

[6] Winkler, 24.

[7] *State Gazette,* Sept, 13, 1851.

Nevertheless, in the fall of 1851, whilst editorial comments were being written on the subject, a call was issued for a preliminary meeting to be held at the Capitol, November 10. At this meeting it was decided to hold a state convention, January 8, 1852, and to ask all the counties to coöperate by sending delegates.[8] When the convention met, only twenty-one counties were represented. A resolution to invite the Democratic members of the legislature to represent their respective counties, if they had no delegates present, was then adopted. The platform, which was drawn up at the meeting, recommended Sam Houston to the National party as a candidate for the presidency.[9]

Simultaneously, the Whigs, although still unorganized, were becoming keenly interested in national issues. In 1852 they held two conventions—one at Tyler and the other at Houston. At both meetings resolutions were adopted approving the administration of President Fillmore, and favoring internal improvements by the National Government.[10] The delegation sent to the National Convention voted for Fillmore as the party's candidate for the presidency.[11] However, the nomination of General Scott was a great disappointment. Two of the Whig electors refused to serve, and a Whig journal (the *Victoria Advocate*) refused to support him.[12] In giving the reasons for its stand the latter said:

> We thoroughly understand the temper and wishes of the abolitionists of the North, to whom General Scott owes his nomination. The same power which could procure his nomination could control his administration, and then where would we be?[13]

In 1853, there being at least four Democratic candidates for the governorship and prospects of an extra legislative session during the winter, the Democratic press proposed holding a state nominating convention so as to eliminate undesirable candidates and secure a Democratic victory.[14] Alluding to the matter, the *State Gazette* said:

[8] *State Gazette*, Nov. 8; 15, 1851.
[9] *State Gazette*, Jan. 10; 17, 1852.
[10] *State Gazette*, May 8; 22, 1852.
[11] Winkler, 29.
[12] Winkler, 29.
[13] *State Gazette*, July 24, 1852.
[14] Winkler, 29.

We must either select one candidate to be supported by the entire party and make victory certain or we will have three or four Democrats in the field with almost an equal certainty of defeat.[15]

There was still strong opposition to the holding of a convention. Some considered the State too large for all the counties to be represented. The *Telegraph* suggested a means of obviating this difficulty. It recommended the holding of county meetings, at which resolutions were to be adopted, authorizing the members of the legislature of the several counties to meet at Austin and elect delegates. But it objected to the selection of candidates by the state representatives, unless primary meetings had been held empowering them to do so.[16] However, it was finally agreed to hold the convention, and February 22 was the date set for the same.[17] Meanwhile the Whigs were closely observing the movements of the Democrats. A correspondent of the *Galveston Journal* remarked:

Let us (the Whigs) not attempt an organization by calling a state or district convention, but when it is in our power to elect a Whig let us elect one who will show by his honesty and zeal that there is something more than a mere name attached to his party.[18]

This convention was a complete failure. In general, legislative members were delegated to represent their respective counties, but the legislature having adjourned two weeks sooner than expected, the delegates returned to their homes, and when the convention opened delegates from only one county were present.[19]

In an editorial comment on the general apathetic attitude manifested by the people at large toward holding conventions, the *Marshall Republican* stated:

Indeed, there seems to be a prevailing prejudice against conventions . . . a conviction that they are organized by demagogues and party trickery, and that selfish ends are consulted rather than an expression of public opinion.[20]

[15] *State Gazette*, Nov. 6, 1852.
[16] *State Gazette*, Dec. 4, 1852.
[17] Winkler, 30.
[18] Winkler, 30.
[19] *State Gazette*, Feb. 5; 26, 1853.
[20] Reprinted in the *State Gazette*, March 26, 1853.

Another ineffectual attempt at party organization through a state convention representing all the counties was made in June, 1853, when a meeting was held at Washington on the Brazos. Only seven counties were represented; consequently, the intended nominations for State officers were not made.[21] As a result, there were seven Democratic candidates for the gubernatorial office in the campaign which followed. The Whigs, taking advantage of the opportunity offered by these scattered forces, announced the candidacy of William B. Ochiltree. Immediately two of the Democratic candidates, M. T. Johnson and J. W. Henderson, withdrew in favor of E. M. Pease.[22]

The last state convention prior to the campaign of 1855 was held at Huntsville April 21, 1855. Notwithstanding the friendly attitude assumed by the press in general and the choice of a season favorable for traveling, only twelve counties were represented.[23] But while this convention was being held, Know-Nothingism, which gave the impetus to party organization in Texas and which made national issues living issues, was sweeping the State.

Before giving the history of the Know-Nothing movement in Texas it is necessary to call attention to the factors which contributed to such success as it achieved.

While reminiscences of the Texan Revolution, such as the fall of the Alamo and the Massacre of Fannin's men, kept alive racial animosity, and the moral and social standards of the lower Mexican class offered no inducements for abandoning prejudices, these were not the prime factors of the prevailing anti-Mexican hostility. The Mexicans were accused of fraternizing with the slaves and of aiding and abetting their escape to Mexico. The magnitude of the losses due to this source caused the planters of central and western Texas to devise means for putting an effectual stop to this evil. Several public meetings were held. The citizens of Seguin passed a series of resolutions which exiled peons, as this class of Mexicans was called, from the county and provided for a standing committee of twenty men to enforce the resolutions.[24]

Another meeting was held in Travis County. It provided that all "transient Mexicans" be warned to leave within ten days, and

[21] *State Gazette*, June 25, 1853.
[22] Winkler, 34.
[23] Winkler, 36.
[24] *State Gazette*, Sept. 9, 1854.

that all found in the county after that time would be forcibly expelled, unless their good character and good behavior would be vouched for by responsible American citizens. This meeting provided for the formation of a vigilance committee of forty-eight members to enforce a strict compliance with the provisions of the resolutions.[25]

A third meeting was held in San Antonio, August 29, 1854. It provided "additional guarantees" for the safety of slave property. All persons connected with the escape of slaves were to be prosecuted for a violation of the laws of the State. An executive committee was appointed to open subscriptions in the principal parts of Bexar County to carry out the object of the meeting. This committee was authorized to offer $200 reward for the apprehension and delivery of any absconding slave belonging to a citizen of the county, if the slave was evidently making an effort to reach Mexico. It was also authorized to make the sum of $500 a standing reward for furnishing information leading to the apprehension and conviction of any free person guilty of enticing, stealing, or carrying off a slave from the county.[26]

There were also political grievances against the Mexicans. Although enfranchised, few of them exercised the privilege of voting.[27] Nevertheless, in the election of 1853 the Mexicans of Texas in general, and of San Antonio in particular, were charged with solidly voting for Pease, the successful Democratic candidate;[28] and furthermore, it was said that they were directed to do so by their political bosses.

The *Galveston Journal*, a Whig organ, commenting on the account in the *San Antonio Ledger* of the campaign around San Antonio, added:

> It does not say that these creatures (Mexicans) were the recipients of money—that, like cattle in the market they were purchased at a price. It does say, however, that charges of bribery and corruption

[25] *State Gazette*, Oct. 14, 1854.

[26] *State Gazette*, Sept. 16, 1854.

[27] Olmsted, 163.

[28] The vote for the different candidates for governor was: Pease (Dem.), 13,091; Ochiltree (Whig), 9,178; Wood (Dem.), 5,983; Evans (Dem.), 4,677; Chambers (Dem.), 2,449; and Dancy (Dem.), 315.—Winkler, 34.

were freely buffetted about from side to side, and avers in the most positive terms that an immense amount of money was disbursed on the occasion.[29]

The *Journal* maintained that five hundred of the nine hundred votes cast in San Antonio were dishonest.[30] An excerpt from the *San Antonio Ledger* quoted by the same journal maintained that, if the manner in which that election was conducted should be taken as a model for future campaigns, men of character and worth would no longer seek places of honor and trust in the State, for they would "scorn to bemire themselves in so filthy a contest." [31] An editorial in the *Indianola Bulletin* remarked that in San Antonio there were some intelligent, honorable, and patriotic Mexicans, who, like many Americans there, had always opposed that plan of conducting campaigns.[32]

There were also economic grievances against the Mexicans. Their economic standards being lower than those of the Americans, they, as cartmen engaged in hauling merchandise from the coast to the interior towns, were able to underbid the American teamsters to such an extent as to practically rule them out of that business.[33]

Apart from the Mexican, the most important foreign element in Texas at that time was the German. In the forties, the Germans entered the State in large numbers, coming over under the auspices of the "Gesellschaft Zum Schutze Auswanderer nach Texas."

This association, according to Frederick Kapp, a renowned forty-eighter, was suggested by Count von Castell (an adjutant of the Duke of Nassau), who, having conceived the idea of building up a large German colony by concentrating immigration from Hessen and the surrounding countries, excited the interest of a number of minor princes and influential noblemen in his project.[34] In 1844 the company published its by-laws and obtained a charter from the Duke of Nassau. The Prince of Leiningen became president; Count Castrell, director; Prince Frederick of Prussia, the Duke of

[29] *Galveston Journal*, Aug. 25, 1853.
[30] *Ibid.*
[31] *Ibid.*
[32] *Galveston Journal*, Aug. 25, 1853.
[33] Linn, 352-354.
[34] *New York Tribune*, Jan. 20, 1855.

Coburg-Gotha, and some thirty other princes and noblemen became associate members.[35]

As stated in its by-laws, the purposes of the organization were: To assist the emigrant by means of advice and substantial aid, and to open new markets for German industry and commerce.[36]

A plan to entice immigrants to Texas was published. It offered each adult who would subscribe $120 a deed for forty acres of land, and a free passage; and to every family subscribing $240 it gave a deed for eighty acres of land, and a free passage.[37] It promised to supply block-dwelling houses, stock and farming implements at low prices; to erect schools and churches in accordance with the requirements of the inhabitants; and to provide for the employment of physicians, apothecaries and the founding of a hospital.[38] In 1844, 180, and in 1845, 2,000 families subscribed to these terms. But there is no accurate estimate as to the exact number which landed in Texas. According to Adolph Douai, editor of the *San Antonio Zeitung,* the Association, during the period of its entire existence (1844-1853), sent over 30,000 colonists.[39] Most of these were massed in a few of the western counties, with San Antonio and New Braunfels as their chief centers. Nearly all the inhabitants of Comal, Gillespie, and Medina counties, three-fourths of the inhabitants of Victoria and Colorado Counties, one-third of the inhabitants of Fayette, Caldwell, and Travis Counties, and of the city of San Antonio, one-fourth of the inhabitants of Calhoun, Bastrop, and Bexar (excluding San Antonio) were Germans.[40] These immigrants built up communities that were highly characteristic of the mother country.[41]

Their national ideals were fostered and preserved by means of societies. The first one, the Deutscher Verein für Texas, was founded in Houston in 1840. Its aims as embodied in its constitution were: (1) to promote the material and general welfare of

[35] *Ibid.*
[36] *Ibid.*
[37] *Ibid.*
[38] Kapp, *Aus und über Amerika,* I, 254.
[39] *Tribune,* Jan. 20, 1855; Benjamin, 59.
[40] Olmsted, 428.
[41] Benjamin, 74; Bracht, 107.

the Germans in the Republic; (2) to counsel and encourage the immigrant; and (3) to provide for the wants of the sick and the needy.[42]

The second society on record was that of the Teutonic Order, founded at Industry in 1841. The purposes of the organization were to preserve German national individuality, to further German immigration, and to facilitate correspondence with Germany.[43]

Fritz Ernest, the founder of the colony of Industry, alluding to the society, said that it remained for the Germans in Texas either to become Americanized and be called Americans, or to make an attempt in a social way to form a new Germany among the Germans in Texas, but that the former appeared neither to him nor to the Germans in general to be feasible or possible, while the latter could only be accomplished through union of all the Germans. This latter, he maintained, would necessitate the reëstablishment of harmony of thought and action among them, and the renewal of their appreciation of German nationality as well as a renewal of the consciousness of their German dignity. Furthermore, he asserted that he believed that, since the population of Texas consisted of immigrants from different countries, all of whom must consider themselves foreigners, the plan could be carried out more easily in Texas than in the United States, where already a native generation had sttled down.[44]

A very popular type of German society, the Saengerbund, was first organized at New Braunfels, March 2, 1850, for the primary purpose of perpetuating German ideals,[45] and last in the order of time was the Turnverein organized in Houston in January, 1854, for the physical and mental training of its members.[46]

The aims of the foregoing societies, especially the attempt to preserve their national ideals and customs, tended to prevent the commingling of the German and the native American elements. Furthermore, this state of isolation was widened into a breach by the competition between free and slave labor. The Germans had free

[42] *Telegraph and Texas Register*, Dec. 9, 1840.
[43] Körner, 359.
[44] *Anzeiger d. Westens*, (St. Louis) Oct. 27, 1841.
[45] Tiling, 137.
[46] Tiling, 163.

labor alone, their cotton fields were small but well cultivated, and the cotton was carefully picked.[47] This free labor cotton, because of its great cleanliness, brought a higher price in the market than cotton picked by slaves.[48]

The activities of the political refugees scattered among the German communities tended to widen this breach into manifest hostility. These immigrants, like those of their corresponding type in the other States of the Union, were anxious to organize themselves for the purpose of being able to exercise an influence adapted to their principles upon national and state politics.

In 1853 the refugees of the colony of Sisterdale, located northwest of San Antonio, organized the "Freie Verein." In their appeal through the press to the Germans in the State they narrated their demands. They were in favor of a gradual elimination of slavery, and the abolition of the fugitive slave laws; they advocated that religion be a private and not a political concern; that a free citizen be not forced by civil authority to comply with or abstain from religious practice and observances. Furthermore, they considered Sunday laws, Thanksgiving days, prescribed prayers in Congress and the legislatures, the oath upon the Bible, the demand for the introduction of the Bible into the public schools, the exclusion of atheists from court proceedings a violation of the rights of man. They also demanded that the Jesuit Order be considered and treated as an open enemy of the Union; and the emancipation of women, equal rights for free negroes with the whites, the abolition of the death penalty and of special military law in times of peace.[49]

This proclamation of political principles, made in the German language and confined in its circulation to the German people, produced no disturbance—its only result, in so far as the writer was able to ascertain, was to give an impetus to political endeavors among their own element in the State. An evidence of this fact was shown in 1853 when the Germans in general began to manifest signs of greater interest in politics. A meeting was held in the vicinity of New Braunfels, August 14, at which it was decided to

[47] Benjamin, 72.

[48] Benjamin, 72.

[49] Siemberg, A., "Die Lateinische Ansiedlung in Texas", *Die deutsche Pionier*, X, 60; "Aus Texas"; *Atlantische Studien*, V, 214.

organize a social club and hold political discussions at its regular monthly meetings. The primary purpose of the organization was to enable the Germans to act as a unit in political affairs.[50] In the beginning of 1854 two other political organizations were founded in Gillespie County—one by the Germans of Fredericksburg, and the other by the settlers on the Pedernales and Live Oak Creek. Each of these organizations strove to interest its members in political questions by means of discussions, the reading of newspapers, periodicals, and other current literature.[51]

A meeting,[52] small in point of numbers, but very significant in its consequences, was held in San Antonio, May 15, 1854. As it was intended to be a gathering of all the Germans in the State, it was held on the day following the celebration of the second Staats-Saenger-fest in that same city. That the platform adopted was typical of the platforms being adopted by political refugees from Germany in several other States of the Union, as well as typical of that of the National Freie Verein [53] drawn up in Kentucky in the same year, may be seen from its contents:

Preamble: Whereas we are of the conviction that the people of the United States are not enjoying the liberty which their constitution promises them nor are they occupying the position to which their power and expansion entitle them, as regards foreign nations, and whereas we have perceived that the existing parties have neither the will nor the power to improve the political, social and religious conditions of the United States in accordance with the wishes of a large number of American citizens; we have united in the declaration of a series of principles, to the end, that, as regards the new parties that are presumably forming, we shall go hand in hand with that party which offers us the most guarantees of the realization of our demands. Hereby we wish, at the same time, to protest against any charge that it is our purpose to form a *German Party,* and we wish to declare that our union as Germans has solely a linguistic basis.

[50] *New Braunfels Zeitung,* Aug. 12; 19, 1853.
[51] *New Braunfels Zeitung,* Jan. 20; 27, 1854.
[52] It was called by the Freie Verein of Sisterdale and San Antonio.
[53] Busey, 14 ff.; Sanderson, 220-222.

A. Political Reform

1. The constitution of the United States is the best in existence. Yet it is, as all existing things, capable of, and in need of greater development. We demand therefore:

a. The direct election of the President and Senators by the people.

b. The election by the people of the judges, postmasters, revenue officers, and all administrative officers with the exception of cabinet officers and ambassadors.

c. The removal, by due process of law and justice, of officers, not because of party affiliation, but because of inefficiency or neglect of duty.

d. Eligibility without respect to the domicile of the candidate.

e. The right of the electors to recall through a majority vote representatives whose work is not satisfactory to them.

2. In order that the United States may occupy a worthy place among the nations of the world, and that she may exercise her influence on the development of liberty, we demand:

a. The recognition and maintenance of republican states through active help.

b. The extension of protection to American citizens in foreign lands.

c. The maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine.

d. The abolition of all extradition treaties.

3. The Army and the Navy are institutions for the protection of the country and its people, and, therefore, they deserve the recognition and attention of the same as a national body politic.

Therefore we demand:

a. Only citizens, and aliens who have taken out their first naturalization papers, at least one year previous shall be soldiers.

b. Abolition of corporal punishment.

c. The soldier in times of peace shall be judged as other citizens.

d. The abolition of military training schools.

e. The creation of training schools for officers from the ranks and civil training for officers in theory and practice.

B. Social Reforms

1. Legislation and the administration of justice exist for the purpose of further promoting and protecting the rights of the citizen in accordance with the demands of the spirit of the age. Punishment shall not go further than such protection requires.

Therefore we demand:

a. Universally valid criminal and civil laws, which, because of their simplicity and precision, shall be so clear to every citizen that the assistance of lawyers may be rendered unnecessary.

b. The confrontation of the plaintiff before defendant, and thereby the abolishment of the Grand Jury.

c. Abolition of imprisonment for debt.

d. A fixed amount of property necessary for subsistence shall not be subject to legal sale.

e. The equalization of labor with capital in all laws pertaining thereto.

f. The abolition of capital punishment.

g. Laws for furthering immigration and for the better protection of the immigrant.

h. The abolition of all temperance laws.

2. Slavery is an evil, the final abolition of which, according to Democratic principles, is necessary. However, as this concerns only individual states, we demand: That the National Government shall abstain from all interference in slavery matters; but that, if any State should decide to abolish this evil, it may demand the assistance of the Federal Government in carrying its decision into effect.

3. Speculation in land shall not be permitted, but land should be considered a means of evaluating working-power.

Hence we demand:

a. That not only to every citizen but to every alien in the State shall be given free, on demand, a suitable piece of public land for his own use.

b. The abolition of all sales of public lands to others than actual settlers.

4. Taxes having no other purpose except that of defraying the expenses of the Government are to be fixed solely according to the extent of these expenses and must be distributed according to ability of payment as equally as possible. Therefore we demand:

a. Direct taxation.

b. An income tax so fixed that the larger income be taxed relatively higher.

c. A progressive inheritance tax.

d. Higher taxation of uncultivated land so as to restrict usury in land.

e. The greatest possible freedom of trade.

5. Banks can only serve the purpose of giving those without means protection against the power of capital and of supporting trade.

Therefore we demand:

a. The abolition of banks in their present organization.

b. The establishment of credit institutions on a safer basis.

6. Internal improvements, in so far as they are of general utility must remain in the hands of the Federal Government, yet we demand:

a. The execution of the same through private industry, and public competition in order to prevent the embezzlements that have been prevalent up to the present.

b. Public supervision and guarantee of contracts with laborers.

7. It is the duty of the State to look to the education of its youth as republican citizens, and to remove all influence hampering education so far as possible. Therefore we demand:

a. Free schools supported entirely by the State.

b. The total exclusion of religious instruction and religious books from the school.

c. No teacher may be a clergyman.

d. No child may be taken from the public school unless proof

be furnished that a satisfactory equivalent course of instruction in some other manner is guaranteed.

e. The foundation of universities where everyone can be educated free.

f. State examinations for teachers, physicians and druggists.

C. Religious Reform

Religion is a purely private affair. The United States are political States and have no right to interfere in religious affairs, either by restrictions or by showing preference; therefore we demand:

a. The abolition of the religious oath.

b. Abolition of Sunday laws and Thanksgiving Days.

c. That Congress and the legislatures shall not be opened with prayer.[54]

In addition to the Mexican and the German, the third, and for this particular study, the last element worthy of note was the French. In 1842 Henri Castro, a former Napoleonic soldier, having obtained a grant of land from the Republic of Texas, returned to France in quest of colonists. With this end in view he, while in Europe, published under his own name and those of others several pamphlets, such as *Coup d' Oeil sur Texas; Documents on Foreign Commerce; Texas in 1845*; and *The State of Texas.* This literature had the desired effect; for, notwithstanding the fact that the French Government was endeavoring to direct emigration to Algiers, Castro succeeded in bringing to Texas 5,200 colonists, all of whom were natives of Alsace, Lorraine and Frenche Comté.[55] These foreigners were mostly farmers whose interests were centered mainly in agriculture, and who, in consequence, furnished no opportunity for unfriendly demonstrations on the part of the American.

But, on the other hand, the arrival of a colony of French Socialists aroused strong opposition on the part of both Democrats and Know-Nothings. The *State Gazette* declared that industrial immigrants—mechanics, laborers, enterprising merchants and business

[54] Translation made from the platform as it appeared in the *New Braunfels Zeitung*, May 19, 1854. Original appears in the appendix.

[55] Castro, Lorenzo, 2 ff.

men—were always welcome, but that Texas had no disposition to receive the Socialist, for he was an abolitionist everywhere and would not be less opposed to slavery by living in Texas than in France or Ohio.[56] Furthermore, besides being abolitionists, these French Socialists were hostile to Catholicism.[57]

Another, and the last factor considered, which furthered the development of the Know-Nothing movement in Texas was the encouragement and whole-hearted support given to its religious aspects by the sectarian press.

An article in the *Texas Presbyterian* reads:

> The cry now is in certain quarters, religious persecution; and while the mass of American citizens, without falter, pledge anew their lives, fortune and sacred honor, to secure Catholics, Jews, and all others, the full and free exercise of their religion, with the promise that all others shall enjoy like privileges, it is preposterous to raise the cry of persecution; and the meaning of the cry would be, let Catholics persecute all others, as a matter of right and even duty.
>
> The Catholic power has made the attempt to destroy our common schools, because they are ungodly; that is they are not Popish. The decree of Benedict VIII is in the canon law which bids the conscience of every Romanist, that it is necessary to salvation that every creature should be subject to the Pope. Hence they must be subject to the teaching of the Pope, and he requires that all the world should be taught Popery. Every teacher in a school, college, or academy is

[56] *State Gazette*, Feb. 15, 1855.

[57] Their leader, Victor Considerant, in giving the history of the party, said that they had struggled in Europe for the triumph of the ideas which the United States had already realized, in part, at least, in its political and social institutions; that they had been vanquished by brute force, by despotism, ignorance and darkness; that in Europe the saber and the cassock had triumphed over intellect and crushed the power of speech; and that, though vanquished for the moment, they were not discouraged.

Moreover, in his allusion to the social and political conditions then prevailing in Europe, Considerant asserted that these conditions were driving from the continent men of free thought and aspirations, who could live only in the expansive atmosphere of liberty, and who had been stifled under the monstrous weight with which "the triple alliance of the Pharisees of the Bourse, of the Jesuits, and of the Sword" had covered the European continent.—Considerant, Victor, *European Colonization in Texas*, 10-29.

bound, on oath, to teach and cause to be taught, the Popish system to all his pupils. . . .

The present uprising of the American masses to check Popery, in preventing it from transferring the reins of government from the people to the Pope, is no religious creed of Papists. . . . With him (papist) it is a part of his religion to burn Bibles, shut up our places of worship, Romanize all our schools, require that we pass no legislative acts that do not promote the good of the Church of Rome, muzzle the press, destroy the liberty of conscience, etc. These demands are enormous. They are not allowed, whatever defeated politicians or others may say about religious persecution; and such a cry comes with a very bad grace from those who have identified themselves politically with the civil patronage of the church which makes it a part of her religion to persecute others, because they choose to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience.[58]

Summary

A synopsis of the content of this chapter falls into two divisions. In the first place an attempt has been made to sketch in brief outline political life as it existed in the State from 1845, the admission of Texas to the Union, to 1854, the rise of the Know-Nothing party in the State, and to show that during this period there was an absence of clearly drawn party lines and a general apathy toward national affairs. It has been indicated that because of a failure to hold state conventions there were as many candidates for the higher offices as chose to run, and that these were supported more out of personal attachment than party principles. However, due to the activities of Know-Nothingism, a reverse policy was about to be adopted.

The second half of the chapter is devoted to the foreign elements in the State—their political, economic, and social activities. The reactions of the native-born Americans toward these activities have not, in all instances, been adequately treated, as it seemed more appropriate to study them in connection with the Know-Nothing movement, which will be presented in the following chapter.

---

[58] *The Texas Presbyterian*, Nov. 25, 1854.

CHAPTER V

Know-Nothingism in Texas, 1854-1860

In 1854 the newspapers in Texas made frequent but brief references to the progress being made by the Know-Nothing party in the United States. However, one of the first real inklings of the party's existence in Texas was contained in an article in the *Brownsville Flag* in June, 1854. It remarked that the party was making rapid progress in the State; that its presence had been noticed in San Antonio in the preceding February; and that since then, it had spread over all western Texas.[1] But it was in San Antonio when very unexpectedly it carried the elections in the December municipal contests of 1854 that actual evidence of its secret political activities were given.[2] In Galveston, another stronghold of the party, it gained the mayoralty in March, 1855.[3] On June 11, 1855, it held a secret State convention at Washington on the Brazos River, elected the officers of the Grand Council, and adopted resolutions. In conformity with these resolutions, the Grand Secretary was ordered to have printed for distribution among the subordinate councils in the State 500 copies of the amendments of the constitution of the Grand Council as well as copies of such resolutions and acts of the Grand Council as he might deem of importance for them to possess. The new ritual presented at the call session of the Grand Council the preceding April was rejected, and the old ritual retained as the work of the party in Texas. The Grand Secretary was ordered to inform all the subordinate councils throughout the State of the nominations made for offices; to notify each to appoint a vigilance committee consisting of five persons, who should endeavor to spread the principles of the party and secure the election of the entire Know-Nothing State ticket; and to instruct the subordinate councils to appoint orators for their respective counties. These latter were to defend Know-Nothing principles when attacked, to recommend the

[1] Quoted by *State Gazette*, July 1, 1854.
[2] *Texas State Times*, January 6, 1855.
[3] Winkler, 37.

names of aspirants for county offices, and represent the interests of the Know-Nothing candidates for state offices.

The following were elected officers of the Grand Council of Texas:

Grand President.....R. E. Baylor, of Washington
First Vice-President.....Thos. M. Likens, of Rusk
Second Vice-President.....N. Holland, of Austin
Third Vice-President.....I. L. Hewitt, of Bexar
Grand Secretary.....B. F. Carter
Grand Treasurer.....G. W. Glascock [4]

The Convention adopted the following state ticket: [5]

Governor.....David C. Dickson,[6] of Grimes
Lieutenant-Governor.....W. G. W. Powers, of Anderson
Western Congressional District.....John Hancock, of Travis
Eastern Congressional District.....L. D. Evans, of Harrison
Commissioner of the General Land Office.....Stephen Crosby [7]

All that was known of this convention outside of the Know-Nothing lodges was merely inferential, conclusions being based on the subsequent acts of men suspected of membership.[8]

The Democrats, still unorganized, were not in a condition to cope with the secret politics of this new party. Due to the fewness of delegates, the Huntsville Convention of April 21 declined to make nominations for state officers, but it suggested the reëlection of E. M. Pease and D. C. Dickson to the governorship and lieutenant-governorship respectively.[9] John Marshall, editor of the *State Gazette,* had been present at this convention, and after his return home he, through his editorials, recommended to the public

[4] *State Gazette,* July 18, 1855.

[5] From 1845 to 1863, the governor, lieutenant-governor, and after 1850 the commissioner of the general land office were elected biennially in the odd years; from 1850 to 1864, the attorney-general, comptroller and treasurer were elected biennially in the even years.—Winkler, 22.

[6] Dickson had been elected lieutenant-governor in 1853 on the same ticket as Governor Pease.

[7] *State Gazette,* July 18, 1855.

[8] Wooten, II, 37.

[9] *State Gazette,* April 28; May 5, 1855.

the reëlection of Pease and Dickson. But when he was apprised of the fact that a Know-Nothing State ticket was entering the contest for political power, and that Dickson was the Know-Nothing nominee for governor, he immediately dropped from his paper the latter's name and called a meeting of the Democrats of Travis County for the afternoon of June 16, to devise means to arrest the Know-Nothing progress. W. S. Oldham, associate editor of the *State Gazette,* who had just forsaken the secret lodge, in a spirited address to the meeting vividly depicted the necessity of Democratic organization. A series of resolutions were drawn up which recommended the formation of Democratic associations, condemned secret political factions, and upheld the Jeffersonian test for office:[10]

Resolved, That the free liberty of speech and the open discussion of political principles are of vital importance to the safety and prosperity of our country, and that we believe all secret political factions as the most mischievous and dangerous enemies of free government that can exist in a time of peace; that the Know-Nothing party is one of these factions, and that we believe that many good men and Democrats have been led to join it with the honest desire to satisfy themselves of its true object; that sufficient time has certainly elapsed to enable it to prove to the world its true character, and while we find it obnoxious to the charges herein declared, as well as to imputed charges of religious intolerance and sweeping proscription of all foreigners, we call upon all worthy Democrats that are its members to come out at once from the organization, . . .

Resolved, That we now and henceforth declare the Know-Nothing party as the enemies of our Government, and we shall regard them in the same light as the Federalist and Whig of a past day, and that we recommend our Democratic brethren in every county of the State to form Democratic Associations, and seek to rout out and destroy in the August election an old enemy that never has, and never will fight twice under the same flag.

Resolved, That the true test for qualification for office is the test declared by Mr. Jefferson, "Is he honest; is he capable; is he faithful to the Constitution," and that any party which prescribes a different test, and requires no positive declaration of principle other than that the candidate is opposed to placing in office citizens of foreign birth,

[10] *State Gazette,* June 23, 1855.

and, those professing the Roman Catholic religion, is not in accordance with the genius of the American Government, and violates all the fundamental principles of free speech, free press and free conscience upon which the republic was founded.

Resolved, That we believe all real Democrats who have connected themselves with this Know-Nothing brotherhood, without being advised of its true objects, or foreseeing its dangerous tendencies, ought to and will abandon it and resume their position in the ranks of the time-honored party, whose principles they know and approve, and take a pleasure in publicly proclaiming and we cordially invite as well as expect them to pursue this course. In this crisis all who are not for us are against us.

Resolved, That we will support with all open and honorable means as Democrats known to be true, the Hon. E. M. Pease, for governor, and the Hon. P. H. Bell, our ever faithful representative, for Congress, in this District.

Resolved, That we have good reason to believe that Hon. D. C. Dickson is the candidate of another party for governor, we recommend a convention to be called of all Democrats of this county, to meet at this place next Saturday, at three o'clock, to nominate candidates for Senator, Representative and Floater, and to suggest the names of suitable candidates for Lieutenant-Governor and Commissioner of the General Land Office.

As no regular nominations had been made, Democrats, according to custom (as noted in the previous chapter), announced themselves for the various state offices. At the request of the Democrats of western and southern Texas, the *State Gazette,* June 30, 1855, published the name of H. R. Runnels, as the Democratic candidate for lieutenant-governor of the State, and in an editorial recommended him to Democracy as an uncompromising opponent of Know-Nothingism.[11] There were three Democratic candidates in the race for the First Congressional district: George W. Chilton, John T. Mills, and Matthias Ward. In order to concentrate the Democratic vote, Chilton and Mills withdrew during the campaign.[12]

The Second Congressional district had two Democratic aspirants: P. H. Bell, who was seeking reëlection, and C. W. Buckley. The

[11] *State Gazette,* June 30, 1855. [12] *State Gazette,* July 11, 1855.

latter, in the interest of the party, withdrew his candidacy during the course of the campaign. In his letter to the voters of the Second Congressional district, he wrote:

From the present aspect of the approaching election it is evident that a division of the Democratic party of the district is calculated to promote the election of the Know-Nothing Candidate, and not being willing to be instrumental in producing such a result and desiring to promote the harmony of the party to which I have ever belonged, . . . I hereby withdraw from the canvass and in so doing I trust there will be no discord in the ranks of the party.[13]

William Fields was an aspirant for the office of commissioner of the general land office. In recommending him to the public an editorial in the *State Gazette* stated: "He is remarkable for the clearness of his judgment, the dispassionateness of his temper, the eminently practical character of his ideas and the firmness of his convictions." [14]

There were three Democratic candidates [15] for the gubernatorial office: E. M. Pease, M. T. Johnson, and G. T. Wood.[16] Of the three, E. M. Pease was the most available.

His conduct as Chief Executive of the State (1853-1855) met with unanimous approbation. Nevertheless, in 1855, had normal political life prevailed he would have met with strong Democratic opposition because he favored state construction and ownership of railroads. However, in response to a request to declare his attitude towards this issue, he published a circular in which, alluding to the state system of internal improvements, he remarked:

Those who have hitherto given me their confidence and who now differ with me on the subject, I feel satisfied will not condemn me for an honest difference of opinion, where no action is proposed, or can result from that opinion, unless it meets the approval of a majority of the citizens of the State, and to them I now give the assurance, that if they do not approve of my opinions on this subject, I will, if elected,

[13] *State Gazette*, July 18, 1855.

[14] *State Gazette*, July 11, 1855.

[15] During the canvass M. T. Johnson and George T. Wood withdrew their candidacy leaving Pease the only Democratic candidate.

[16] *Gazette*, June 30, 1855.

endeavor to give effect to any practicable plan that may be brought forward to facilitate the construction of such railroads as will meet the wants of the country.

In concluding his circular he pledged himself to make but one issue in the campaign—Democracy *versus* Know-Nothingism.[17]

The Know-Nothing nominees for state offices had been Democrats before their affiliation with the new party. With the vote of every Know-Nothing pledged to them, they were now permitted to assume the deceptive position of entering the canvass as Democrats.[18] Accordingly, Dickson denied the fact that he was a Know-Nothing candidate. In one of the circulars which he issued, he stated:

> The charge so industriously circulated throughout the country, that I am the candidate of the Know-Nothing party, is made with the designing and sinister purpose of diverting public attention from the true issue by raising a false one.[19]

Furthermore, he had his candidacy announced in *The Central Texian,* his own town paper, "for the purpose," it stated, "of making an issue, with Governor Pease on the State Plan of internal improvement.[20] Hancock also issued a circular in which he, too, denied his Know-Nothing candidacy, and maintained that he was running as an independent Democrat.[21] Evans, when charged by A. M. Lewis with membership in the Know-Nothing party, denied his affiliation in the presence of 1000 persons.[22] Crosby objected to the *State Times,* the chief organ of the Know-Nothing party, affixing his name on the Know-Nothing party's ticket. He pretended to be running as an independent Democrat, and not as the nominee of any particular party.[23]

To frustrate such strategems the *State Gazette* suggested in its editorial section a set of questions which it recommended to be put to every aspirant for political office within the State, and to which it would demand unequivocal answers:[24]

[17] *Gazette,* June 30, 1855.
[18] Wooten, II, 37.
[19] *State Gazette,* July 18, 1855.
[20] *State Gazette,* July 11, 1855.
[21] *State Gazette,* June 30, 1855.
[22] *Gazette,* Aug. 4, 1855.
[23] *State Gazette,* July 25, 1855.
[24] *State Gazette,* July 28, 1855.

Do you belong to any secret political society whatever, without reference to its name?

Are you opposed to voting against naturalized citizens, for any office, whatever?

Are you opposed to voting against all persons, professing the Roman Catholic religion for all offices, whatever?

Are you in favor of removing all naturalized foreigners, and citizens professing the Roman Catholic religion, from all offices and places?

Do you or not belong to a secret political society which requires you to vote the will of the majority of that society, regardless of your own predilections?

In addition to the Press[25] every available anti-Know-Nothing speaker,[26] in stump speeches, denounced the movement. These men expounded and defended the principles of Democracy and exposed the proscriptive features of the new party. They maintained that Know-Nothingism was inaugurating a racial war; that Texas needed immigrants to develop its resources; that the party was introducing religion into the administration of the govern-

[25] Nearly every Democratic paper in the State took part in the contest against Know-Nothingism: *Texan*, San Antonio; *Ledger*, San Antonio; *State Gazette*, Austin; *Herald*, Lavaca; *Chronicle*, Matagorda; *Planter*, Brazoria; *Democrat*, Columbia; *Sun*, Richmond; *Ranger*, Washington; *Item*, Huntsville; *Democrat*, Henderson; *Herald*, Dallas; *Republican*, Marshall; *Standard*, Clarksville; *Advocate*, Palestine; *Sentinel*, Rusk; *New Braunsfeller*, New Braunfels; *Advocate*, Victoria. Among the papers which supported the Know-Nothing party the following were prominent: *Recorder*, Huntsville; *State Times*, Austin; *Weekly Confederate*, Galveston; *Messenger*, Clarksville; *Star Spangled Banner*, Houston; *Advertiser*, Bastrop; *American*, Goliad; *Meridian*, Marshall; *Herald*, San Antonio; *America*, Washington; *True Issue*, La Grange; *America*, Palestine.—*Gazette*, Aug. 4, 1855; *The Washington America*, May 7, 1856; *Civilian*, quoted by *State Gazette*, Aug. 4, 1855.

[26] Among the outstanding Democrats in the State at large who ably and uncompromisingly fought the Know-Nothing party either by pen or on the stump, were: George W. Paschal, A. J. Hamilton, James Willie, A. W. Terrell, W. S. Oldham, John W. Harris, S. O. Sneed, R. Brownrigg, John Marshall, J. Pinckney Henderson, Franklin W. Bowden, Louis T. Wigfall, Malcolm D. Graham, John H. Reagan, O. M. Roberts, John T. Mills, George W. Chilton, Mat. D. Ector, Ex-President Anson Jones and Senator Rusk.—*State Gazette*, June 30, 1855; Wooten, II, 38.

ment, and that, therefore, it was not in harmony with the principle of the separation of church and state, and hence un-American.[27] The first visible result of their efforts was that men who, without due consideration, had affiliated with the party abandoned its lodges. The *State Gazette,* July 21, 1855, recounts the withdrawal of 100 members from the lodge in Washington; 70 from that of Austin County; and 25, from the lodge of Chappel Hill.[28] But the most significant of all withdrawals took place in Houston, when 125 members met, and after drawing up and endorsing a series of resolutions, ordered the archives to be burned, and then disbanded:[29]

Whereas, a dispensation with a constitution and ritual, was given for the formation of a Wigwam, commonly known as "Know-Nothings," in the City of Houston, which was commended to us by what we believed to be true Republican principles, and whereas, since organizing under such dispensations, constitution and ritual, said organization has been declared illegal by the Grand Council, and another constitution and ritual has been forwarded to us for our government, and whereas, we believe that the said constitution and ritual is in opposition to the constitution and laws of our glorious confederacy—unjust, illiberal, anti-republican, and proscriptive in their nature, a direct interference with the religious rights of a large portion of the American people, and which, if successfully carried out, will breed ill feeling and discord between citizens, and tend materially to weaken those bonds which should bind us together as one people.

Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we do not recognize in the constitution and ritual forwarded to us by the Grand Council, those principles of Republicanism and reverence for the laws, which induced us to band together for a common good but in their stead, we find its antagonism, intolerance and proscriptive principles alike at war with the constitution and laws of the Union, and the teachings of those wise men of the revolution, who pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor for the maintenance of civil and religious liberty.

Resolved, That holding the above truths to be evident, we cannot subscribe to the doctrines set forth in the constitution and ritual, and we therefore declare this organization dissolved—Houston, Texas, July 24, 1855.

[27] Wooten, II, 37.

[28] *State Gazette,* July 21, 1855.

[29] *State Gazette,* July 28, 1855.

During this campaign, and as long as the Know-Nothing party existed, there were Democratic mass meetings in every section of the State. At some of these thousands of people were assembled. One of the first, and probably the largest, was held in San Antonio, where the Democracy of Bexar County resolved that it would use all legal means at its disposal to secure the reëlection of Pease to the governorship of the State and Bell to the Congress of the United States, and that it would select only stalwart Democrats, who were unyielding opponents of Know-Nothingism, for lieutenant-governor, and for commissioner of the general land office. It condemned Know-Nothingism as being fundamentally opposed to the sentiments contained in the Declaration of Independence, to the principles embodied in the Constitution of the United States and in that of the State as well as to the spirit of the American laws and institutions:[1]

Resolved, That democracy being the party of equal rights, and recognizing all citizens as equal before the laws, cannot therefore, proscribe any man for the accident of birth or mere religious opinions, and is in its very nature opposed to all creeds or organizations, no matter what the proposed object of such organization may be, if those associations advocate the principle of proscription or the doctrine of intolerance.

Resolved, That the organization commonly called "Know-Nothingism," as shown by its advocates, and proven by its actions, is at war with the essential principles of Democracy—at war with the principles of the Constitution, the sentiments contained in the Declaration of Independence, and the spirit of our laws and institutions, and displays in unmistakable characters, the most objectionable form under which the open or secret foes of Democracy have ever acted.

Resolved, That the darkness and secrecy enveloping "Know-Nothing" Meetings give just ground of suspicion and well-founded cause of alarm, in a country possessing the greatest facilities for open action and free discussion, and particularly so when our customs and our laws permit and encourage the fullest measure of publicity on all political subjects, and the existence of such a secret midnight association, should warn all lovers of civil and religious freedom that evils, like those inflicted on other nations by secret political associations, may fall upon our own if such secret organizations be not speedily and effectually crushed.

[30] *State Gazette*, June 30, 1855.

Resolved, That the existence in our midst of such a secret political association holding its midnight meetings, and binding its members by oaths to secrecy, is such an organization as calls for the jealous vigilance and prompt action of Southern men and true Democrats; particularly so, when such an association originated at the North and counts its greatest numbers, and achieved its principal victories in the hot beds of free-soilers and abolitionists.

Resolved, That as Democrats and friends of open action and free discussion, we here fully and unequivocally pledge ourselves to an undying opposition to the principles and practices of this proscriptive, intolerant and secret association called "Know-Nothingism" or to any attempt direct or indirect, either by Catholics or Protestants, to bring about a "Union of Church and State."

Resolved, That we earnestly invite all Democrats and good citizens (without distinction of party) who may have been induced under mistaken views to join this secret order, to retrace their steps and dissolve their connection with a party, afraid or ashamed to let the object of, and the proceedings at its meetings be known to the public, such proceedings as its advocates assert, being of a political nature.

Resolved, That we will use all proper efforts to secure the election of the Hon. E. M. Pease for governor of the State and Hon. P. H. Bell, representative in the second Congressional District, we have full confidence in their capacity, integrity and opposition to the secret order called "Know-Nothings."

Resolved, That a Committee of five be appointed to report to a call meeting of the Democracy of Bexar, the names of the candidates for Lieut. Governor and Commissioner of the General Land Office, in whom reliance can be placed for their opposition to "Know-Nothingism," and upon whom centers the chief strength of the Democracy of the State.

Resolved, That a Committee of seven (amended fifteen) be appointed, whose duty it shall be to take prompt and efficient action for the organization of the Democratic party in Bexar County.

Resolved, That the Democracy throughout the West be requested and invited to arise in their strength, hold meetings, and organize in their respective counties and prove by their annihiliation of the proscriptive "Know-Nothing" Association that the strength and the spirit of Democracy has not departed.

As San Antonio was the strongest center of the Know-Nothing

party in Texas, it was also the place where the party met with the greatest opposition. A second enthusiastic mass meeting was held there July 3, 1855. It pledged itself to support no man for office who was not uncompromisingly opposed to secret political organization, and it organized a correspondence committee to interrogate all candidates for office:[31]

Resolved, That we, as members of the Democratic party of Bexar County, will support no man for office, who is not unequivocally opposed to the Secret Political Organization known to outsiders as "Know-Nothings," and to all Secret Political Societies.

Resolved, That the evidence of such opposition to "Know-Nothings" shall consist in a manly and public avowal, in writing, with a view to publication in the newspapers.

Resolved, That a committee[32] of three be appointed whose duty it shall be to interrogate all candidates for office as to their views in relation to "Secret Political Societies" and to report their answer to a future meeting.

Governor Pease's reply to the inquiries contained in the letter of the San Antonio Correspondence Committee was prompt and unyielding in character. He declared:

I am not now and never have been associated with, or a member of the Know-Nothing party, nor any other secret political party, association, or organization whatever. To the principles and objects of the Know-Nothing party . . . so far as they have been made known, I am unalterably opposed.

The proscription of American citizens on account of their foreign birth, or their religious creed, is anti-Republican and contrary to the letter and spirit of our Constitution, which recognizes no distinction between native and foreign born citizens, and expressly declares that no human authority ought in any case whatever, to control or interfere with the rights of conscience in matters of religion.[33]

A mass meeting at Galveston, July 2, 1855, pledged its support to E. M. Pease for the governorship of the state, and to P. H. Bell for Congress. It also incorporated in a set of resolutions all

[31] *Gazette*, July 25, 1855.

[32] The Correspondence Committee was increased to five members and consisted of J. M. Devine, R. E. Clements, J. C. Wilson, S. S. Smith, I. A. Paschal, and D. C. Van Derlip.

[33] *State Gazette*, July 18, 1855.

the guarantees of civil rights embodied in the federal and state constitutions: [34]

Resolved, That the Democracy of Galveston County have unabated confidence in the wisdom of the declarations of the national constitution that "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States;" that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; and a like confidence in the wise and patriotic objects of the declaration of our state constitution that "all freemen when they form a social compact, have equal rights; and no man or set of men is entitled to exclusive separate public emoluments or privileges, but in consideration of public services;" "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust in this State;" "All men have the natural and indefeasible right to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience;" "No human authority ought, in any case, whatever, to control or interfere with the rights of conscience in matters of religion; and no preference shall be given by law to any religious society or public worship;" "every citizen shall be at liberty to speak, write, and publish his opinions on any subject;" "the citizens shall have the right in a peaceable manner, to assemble together for the common good; to apply to those invested with the powers of government for redress of grievances or other purposes;" and "ministers of the gospel being by their profession dedicated to God and the care of souls, ought not to be diverted from the great duties of their functions to mingle in political strife.

We would render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's. As Democrats and Americans we are not only in favor of the eternal separation of Church and State, but equally opposed to any union of politics and religion—especially to arousing a spirit of religious bigotry and intolerance in order to turn the same to partisan purposes.

Resolved, That in E. M. Pease the Democracy of Texas have a true and tried standard-bearer for the office of Governor, and that we will give him our cordial and hearty support. . . .

Resolved, That the evidences before us are conclusive that Col. P. H. Bell has been marked for proscription by the new political party, organized in opposition to the Democracy, and we will contribute our support to sustain him against all secret and indirect assaults.

[34] *State Gazette*, July 11, 1855.

Resolved, That we will unite with the Democrats of Texas in support of any honest, capable, tried and reliable Democrats for the office of Lieutenant-Governor and Commissioner of the General Land Office, in opposition to the nominees of a secret Junta, with private pledges—whoever and whatever they may be.

Gonzales County assembled in mass meeting, July 14, organized a Democratic Association, and drew up a set of resolutions condemnatory of Know-Nothingism:[35]

Resolved, That it is the deliberate sense of the meeting, that no Democrat should aid or countenance any secret political organization, by whatever name, convinced, as we are, that it is opposed to the genius of free government, destroys free action, and free deliberation, and substitutes in the place of the grand privilege of voluntary suffrage, the behests and decrees of an irresponsible cabal.

Resolved, That to proscribe men on account of their religious opinions, by civil incapacities, only begets habits of hypocrisy; that it is impious presumption in some, to assume dominion over the faith of others; that our civil rights, have no dependence upon our religious opinions whatever, any more than our opinions of Geometry and Physics; that proscribing any citizen, as unworthy the public confidence, by disqualifying him from being called to offices of trust and profit, because he professes this, or that religious opinion, is depriving him injuriously of those privileges, to which, in common, with his fellow citizens, he has a natural right.

Resolved, That we will support the regular nominated candidates of this meeting, as advocates of our views and political preferences; and that we have a firm confidence in our political Brethren of the county, that they will give their individual support to the candidates of the Democratic party, at the coming election, uninfluenced by personal attachments, and unmoved by the artifices of the opposition.

A mass meeting of the citizens of Medina County was held at Castroville, July 21. It nominated State officers, and expressed in a set of resolutions its opposition to secret political associations:[36]

Whereas, religious bigots and old effete broken down politicians have formed a secret organization, with the sworn and avowed purpose of

[35] *State Gazette*, July 14, 1855.

[36] *State Gazette*, Aug. 1, 1855.

disfranchising a large portion of citizens of this glorious Republic. Therefore, be it resolved, that we will support no man, for office, at the coming election, who is not uncompromisingly opposed to that anti-American conspiracy, commonly termed the Know-Nothing party.

Resolved, That the doctrines of religious intolerance and proscription promulgated by the Anti-Americans or Know-Nothings, are a disgrace to the age in which we live.

Resolved, That we consider it our duty, as well as the duty of every American, to maintain to the last extremity the equal and inalienable rights of all our citizens, as at present guaranteed to us by the Constitution of the United States.

Resolved, That we will use our utmost endeavors to defeat the insidious satelites of "Sam," or of any other organization whose avowed object is to subvert and destroy that truly great and distinguished feature of our Government—Civil and Religious liberty.

Resolved, That in accordance with the above resolutions, E. M. Pease is our choice for Governor; P. H. Bell for Congress; S. Maverick for Senator; and Jacob Waelder for Representative. The opinions of the candidates for Lieutenant-Governor and Commissioner of the General Land Office, in relation to "Sam," are not sufficiently explicit to enable us to make a choice for these offices.

Resolved, That we receive with pleasure the intelligence that the great mass of Texans have repudiated the Know-Nothing heresy.

Resolved, That we will conduct the coming contest according to the principles, rules and tactics laid down by a certain old Virginian, known as Thomas Jefferson, Esq., late of Virginia.

Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed to correspond with the citizens of Bexar, Comal and Gillespie Counties.

The German declaration of principles drawn up on May 15, 1854, furnished an excellent opening during the campaign for an attack upon that racial element. Prior to this political contest, the *San Antonio Zeitung,* edited by Dr. Douai, a political refugee, published these resolutions. Consequently, Douai had to bear the brunt of the attacks of the whole press. Undaunted, however, he went further and published his anti-slavery editorials in English so that Americans might read his principles for themselves. This aroused hostility to fever heat. The *State Gazette* (Dem. paper), May 12, 1855, declared:

If the editor of the *Zeitung* is a free-soiler or abolitionist, we would give him the choice of two alternatives—either to desist from building up a doctrine which is to rob us of our property or to take up his march and that quickly, out of the State of Texas.

The *State Times* (K. N. paper), May 19, 1855, in an editorial remarked:

It is a matter of surprise to us that the citizens of San Antonio have tolerated so long in their midst, a nuisance like that of the *Zeitung*. For our own part, as much as we are opposed to "mob law," we could find nothing to censure in the forcible removal of that paper.

The *Galveston News*, June 12, 1855, commenting on the situation affirmed:

The *San Antonio Zeitung* has made itself notorious of late by attacking slavery. Several of the Texas papers have rapped it pretty hard for its temerity in attacking the institutions of the State, and some of them went so far as to suggest that a coat of tar and feathers would be a fit reward for the editor.

However, coincident with the rise of Know-Nothingism as an open issue, the hostility of the Democratic press toward the Germans subsided, whereas that of the Know-Nothings' press grew increasingly aggressive so that the position of the Germans became very trying; for the doings of a few refugees of radical tendencies were charged to the race. The *State Times* charged the German people of Texas with assuming a hostile attitude towards native-born citizens and their domestic and political institutions:[37]

Who are the Germans of Texas, . . . and what are they doing? They are the escaped victims of foreign tyranny and despotism, come to us by invitation, to share the liberties of this country and to enjoy the peace and tranquility and those natural rights of man denied them in their native land. . . .

Then, who is it that has engendered the malignant feelings existing between the Germans of Texas and native Americans which are as yet but germinating, . . . The foreigners of Texas have come among us clothed with the same rights that we are, save the assumption which no foreigner can arrogate to himself of instructing Americans what is best for the weal and good government of America. . . . What is and

[37] *State Times*, June 16, 1855.

has been their conduct touching the fundamental institutions of this republic which the sages of the revolution established and transmitted to us, made sacred by recollections of their heroism and sealed with their patriotic blood? Have they exhibited gratitude for the holy boon granted them of living in a free country, under free laws and among a free people, or have they abused the immunities allowed them and straddled the breeze of arrogance to dictate good laws, good government and sound institutions to the American people? Verily, the Germans have departed from every rule of propriety and from every shadow even of that love of their adopted country by which they should have been actuated, and gone astray after the teachings and bubbles held up to them by traitors and this they cannot deny. Their famous "platform convention" of San Antonio is the first stride towards treason that came before the public eye. . . .

The Germans throughout the State by means of resolutions adopted at mass meetings denied the allegations made against them. The population around New Braunfels assembled in mass meeting, June 26, 1855, adopted resolutions to the effect that, in as much as they had been attacked by almost the entire public press of the State, which had identified them with the sentiments and opinions upon the slavery question as set forth in the *San Antonio Zeitung,* in justification to themselves individually and collectively, they were not responsible and should not be held so. They further maintained that as American citizens of German birth they harbored no unfriendly feeling towards Americans.[38] Moreover, the Germans not only denied the identity of their sentiments with those expressed in the *San Antonio Zeitung* but they even adopted resolutions condemnatory of the latter. Thus the Germans at large approved of the resolutions adopted at a mass meeting at Lockhart, they recommended the dismissal of the editor of the free-soil paper and avowed their Southern sentiments:[39]

Resolved, That we heartily coöperate with the sentiments expressed at a late meeting held at Lockhart, and recommend that the editor of the *San Antonio Zeitung* should be displaced from the editorship of a paper which he has disgraced by his conduct in attempting to disturb the peace and quietness of the community; and that we will heartily join with our American fellow citizens in putting down the said editor,

[38] *State Gazette,* July 11, 1855. [39] *State Gazette,* July 25, 1855.

his aider and abeters, peaceably, or forcibly, as it may be demanded proper.

Resolved, That we recommend to our German countrymen, to discountenance and suppress all attempts to disturb the institution of slavery—upon which is founded the prosperity and happiness of our Southern Country; and to meet and express themselves most decidedly in regard to their true and genuine allegiance to the laws and institutions of the State which we inhabit, at a time when Northern abolitionists take so decided a stand, as to make actual aggression upon the Constitutional rights and the property of our Southern States and threaten to sever the ties by which the states are bound together.

In addition, Jacob Waelder, who represented in the State Legislature the counties of Comal, Gillespie, and Medina, contradicted, on the floor of the House of Representatives, the statement that the Germans were abolitionists. He further affirmed that the objectionable sentiments relative to slavery published in the *San Antonio Zeitung* had emanated from the pen of a member of the Know-Nothing party. The Know-Nothing leaders of the San Antonio unit, endeavoring to make capital out of this statement, appointed a committee of three to interview the editor of the *Zeitung* in order to ascertain the author of the articles in question. They reported through the columns of the *San Antonio Herald* (K. N. paper) that the charge made by Waelder was false and that the articles were written by the editor himself.[40] In reply to the statements made by the committee, an editorial in the *San Antonio Zeitung,* December 1, 1855, stated that two of the anti-slavery articles published in that paper had been written by a member of the Know-Nothing party.[41]

The hostility of the Know-Nothing party toward the Germans hastened the political alignment of that element with the Democrats. Assembled in mass meeting in San Antonio, July 3, the Germans drafted and adopted a set of resolutions which embodied all the essential doctrines of the Democratic party. They pledged their support to the Democratic ticket and ordered the proceedings of their meeting to be published in the German, English, and Spanish papers of San Antonio:[42]

[40] Debates in the Sixth Legislature (1855-1856), 175.
[41] *Ibid.*, 175.
[42] *State Gazette,* Aug. 1, 1855.

We, the German-American citizens of San Antonio, do hereby solemnly declare our unalterable attachment to the Bill of Rights, to the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the land.

Being citizens of the United States in sentiment and by our voluntary oath of allegiance, we recognize in no one the right to declare us "foreigners." We are Americans with all the rights and duties of such; and we declare ourselves solemnly pledged to the unimpaired maintenance of the former; and in the faithful performance of the latter, we will, as we always did, place our greatest pride.

We regret in common with all patriots the corruption of political parties, but we regard as a blind conceit of the so-called American party the assertion that its elements are particularly or exclusively pure. We will regard with distrust men who make a trade of politics, in whatever ranks we may find them.

We honor the principle that "office should seek the man, and not the man the office," and for that very reason we require the freest choice of all citizens, and oppose the monopolizing of offices by the Know-Nothing party.

We will steadily oppose every influence of any religious sect in political matters. Experience has taught us that the puritanical principle is no less tyrannical than that of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. We regard the attempted exclusion of Catholics from all offices, as an act of injustice, proceeding from dark religious fanaticism, unworthy of our civilization and age. Our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens can always rely upon our support against our common enemy.

Knowledge is the surest and only basis of freedom. The fact of the existence of the Know-Nothing party, shows us the urgent necessity of a more general and better system of education, removed from the influence of any religious sect.

The people of the United States cannot guard too anxiously against the slightest influence of foreign governments despotically organized, in our public affairs; but when the so-called American party declares the influence of immigrants or adopted citizens to be dangerous, it only hereby proves that its whole organization is based upon prejudice. As truth is the property of the whole world, and not a monopoly of the natives of the Union, so also is the sense of justice, love of liberty and political equality; and we claim an equal and legitimate share in these, the noblest of all the attributes of humanity, with those citizens whom chance permitted to be born upon the soil of this Union.

We are decidedly opposed to any alteration of the present naturalization laws. We reject as a base and unfounded calumny, the accusa-

tions, that Europe sends us mostly paupers and criminals—an accusation that reflects upon ourselves. We say with pride, that Western Texas owes its prosperity mainly to the efforts of the Germans; and it was first a German American county that lately received the satisfactory testimony of not having a criminal case on its docket. If the Know-Nothings term a fact like this "foreign influence" then we are willing to bear the charge.

The editor of the *State Times* (K. N. paper) described the early days of this campaign of 1855, as follows:

> Never, perhaps, in the history of Texas has the political character of the people presented such an aspect as it does at this moment. Hitherto a campaign could hardly be said to wear anything of a political color, and in many instances the predilection of those who offered themselves for office were not investigated . . . the approaching election is preceded by scenes never before enacted in this State. The strife for office pervades every class of our citizens, and so closely appear party lines to be drawn that we verily believe if a candidate should offer himself for precinct constable, he would be questioned as to what policy he would pursue in the event of his election.[43]

As the day for holding the elections approached, popular interest waxed stronger. The anti-Know-Nothings were warned against voting the bogus ticket, called "The People's Ticket." They were advised to go to the polls quietly and peacefully and "swell the certain never-to-be-forgotten Victory."[44]

Although Democracy gained the victory, the returns showed that the Know-Nothing party had grown remarkably strong in every section of the State. These returns are presented in the following table:

[43] *Texas State Times*, June 30, 1855.
Reprinted in Winkler, 38-39.
[44] *State Gazette*, Aug. 4, 1855.

ELECTION RETURNS, 1855

Counties	Governor. Dem. E. M. Pease	Governor. K. N. D. C. Dickson	Lieutenant Governor Dem. H. R. Runnels	Lieutenant Governor K. N. G. W. G. Jowers	Congress (District II) Dem. P. H. Bell	Congress (District II) K. N. John Hancock	Congress (District I) Dem. M Ward	Congress (District I) K. N. L. D. Evans	Land Commissioner Dem. W. Fields	Land Commissioner K. N. Stephen Crosby
Angelina	60	45	1	77	...	...	13	84	16	93
Anderson	490	433	265	578	...	...	380	536	186	676
Austin	374	233	342	228	372	230	...	...	436	160
Bastrop	433	292	393	297	394	305	...	...	458	216
Bell	322	163	285	153	329	150	...	...	320	111
Bexar	1,682	619	1,667	612	1,711	573	...	...	2,079	132
Bosque	15	45	1	54	29	72	...	...	95	11
Bowie	240	14	101	8	...	...	218	39	189	16
Brazoria	315	41	268	44	258	91	...	...	202	142
Burleson	261	133	193	119	262	124	...	...	249	99
Burnett	73	152	45	140	103	115	...	...	128	91
Caldwell	324	254	299	226	315	263	...	...	282	171
Calhoun	174	96	110	118	160	108	...	...	50	207
Cameron	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Cass	438	357	599	208	...	...	408	409	278	420
Cherokee	895	698	899	691	...	...	904	685	766	797
Collin	275	375	56	124	...	...	246	342	81	536
Colorado	225	85	199	60	...	...	...	...	...	...
Comal	322	28	313	26	...	...	...	...	...	...

Coryell	222	137	203	137	...	...	...	...	...	...
Cooke	99	50	4	101	...	...	126	67	2	181
Dallas	309	221	89	211	...	...	341	205	186	348
Denton	135	112	15	104	...	...	112	120	11	207
De Witt	256	90	231	53	248	85	...	...	128	212
Ellis	152	202	72	144	147	177	...	...	105	241
El Paso	760	...	643	111	636	116	...	...	...	760
Falls	...	...	...	...	80	129	...	...	15	187
Fannin	389	323	100	306	...	...	...	...	...	...
Fayette	509	368	304	385	504	308	...	...	311	395
Freestone	265	175	242	190	247	178	...	...	331	75
Fort Bend	246	33	167	32	219	50	...	...	134	122
Galveston	458	244	424	256	442	251	...	...	496	122
Gillespie	224	47	214	44	245	51	...	...	220	44
Goliad	96	135	84	139	103	126	...	...	201	31
Gonzales	396	411	361	390	399	411	...	...	334	449
Grimes	39	588	18	500	166	428	...	...	204	191
Grayson	255	419	157	300	...	...	260	442	68	565
Guadalupe	340	252	278	245	...	...	...	...	...	...
Harris	415	426	409	321	542	274	...	...	446	352
Harrison	...	...	...	...	...	...	391	674	934	67
Hays	56	102	46	105	60	83	...	...	53	102
Henderson	37	210	33	245	...	...	102	219	12	264

ELECTION RETURNS, 1855—Continued

Counties	Governor.		Lieutenant Governor				Congress (District II)		Congress (District I)		Land Commissioner	
	Dem. E. M. Pease	K. N. D. C. Dickson	Dem. H. R. Runnels	K. N. G. W. G. Jowers	Dem. P. H. Bell	K. N. John Hancock	Dem. M. Ward	K. N. L. D. Evans	Dem. W. Fields	K. N. Stephen Crosby		
Hill	...	...	...	...	57	85	...	...	19	117		
Hopkins	...	...	...	...	...	...	295	387	344	184		
Houston	...	...	...	...	...	...	339	197	274	292		
Hunt	282	151	361	63	...	...	231	272	131	360		
Jackson	...	...	...	...	105	51	...	...	20	137		
Jasper	...	...	...	...	...	...	175	75	2	242		
Jefferson	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		
Johnson	...	...	...	...	182	64	...	...	55	182		
Karnes	...	...	...	...	111	68	...	...	85	87		
Kaufman	...	...	...	...	...	...	125	208	106	168		
Lamar	...	...	...	...	...	...	428	290	246	363		
Lavaca	...	...	...	...	284	175	...	...	201	233		
Leon	...	...	...	...	161	359	...	...	462	29		
Liberty	199	121	160	108	...	...	131	160	248	75		
Limestone	132	234	...	...	167	236	...	...	36	298		
Madison	...	...	...	...	43	117	...	...	123	26		
Matagorda	...	...	...	...	205	10	...	...	6	216		
McLennan	...	...	...	...	180	178	...	...	106	231		
Medina	...	...	...	...	240	7	...	...	235	7		

Milan	...	...	...	...	129	181	...	...	145	127
Montgomery	...	...	...	...	163	214	...	...	47	326
Nacogdoches	...	...	...	...	...	...	488	294	79	642
Navarro	...	...	...	...	189	310	...	...	30	466
Newton	139	64	27	77	...	...	81	77	3	116
Nueces	...	...	...	...	282	53	...	...	49	274
Panola	468	214	386	236	...	...	404	277	398	181
Polk	176	198	192	115	...	...	195	164	250	130
Red River	310	267	288	269	...	...	276	300	275	279
Refugio	93	48	69	40	90	48	...	...	45	89
Robertson	213	206	27	211	34	211	...	...	178	58
Rusk	1,069	663	899	816	...	...	883	837	857	852
Sabine	118	112	47	97	...	...	68	155	8	197
San Patricio	43	23	21	17	51	4	...	...	14	53
San Augustine	270	93	124	141	...	...	200	122	160	146
Shelby	352	187	278	190	...	...	314	228	271	258
Smith	502	263	808	283	...	...	617	548	791	371
Starr	238	84	189	118	306	8	...	...	137	169
Tarrant	543	153	214	222	477	166	...	...	74	613
Titus	371	332	471	189	...	...	286	430	46	641
Travis	419	598	398	595	507	491	...	...	690	295
Trinity	102	84	70	117	...	...	56	127	13	170

ELECTION RETURNS, 1855—Continued

Counties	Governor. Dem. E. M. Pease	Governor. K. N. D. C. Dickson	Lieutenant Governor Dem. H. R. Runnels	Lieutenant Governor K. N. G. W. G. Jowers	Congress (District II) Dem. P. H. Bell	Congress (District II) K. N. John Hancock	Congress (District I) Dem. M. Ward	Congress (District I) K. N. L. D. Evans	Land Commissioner Dem. W. Fields	Land Commissioner K. N. Stephen Crosby
Tyler	208	151	211	59	...	...	247	94	57	310
Upshur	564	220	602	177	...	...	504	340	438	310
Van Zandt	12	109	2	94	...	...	92	143	...	168
Victoria	180	105	171	111	170	114	...	...	172	109
Walker	238	336	226	330	235	316	...	...	476	78
Washington	497	458	456	464	483	461	...	...	446	366
Webb	167	3	167	...	302	...	...	...	167	132
Wharton	110	34	67	45	106	31	...	...	69	70
Williamson	245	281	202	271	282	227	...	...	278	217
Wood	184	38	258	31	...	...	171	229	65	289
Total	21,035	14,536	17,527	13,650	14,379	9,496	10,311	10,342	20,263	21,878

Ref.: Returns for Governor and Lieutenant-Governor obtained from the State Department.
Returns for Congress and Land Commissioner taken from Records of the Executive Office, E. M. Pease's Administration, p. 295-297.
Johnson (Dem.) received 1,024 votes for Governor.
Woods (Dem.) received 234 votes for Governor.
A. Neil (Independent) received 3,129 votes for Lieutenant-Governor.

The success of the Know-Nothings in this campaign did not measure up to their expectation. Strange to say, after having attacked the Germans and Mexicans, this party had counted largely upon the vote of Bexar where both these elements were strong. After the elections the whole anti-Know-Nothing party in this county was vilified by the Know-Nothing press. An excerpt from the *State Times*, August 11, 1855, is typical:

. . . We care not to what party a man may be attached, he can not be a true patriot who fails to discover in the result of the contest in Bexar and Comal, consequences of direful import. He who argues that the unanimity with which the German and Mexican vote was cast against the American candidates, is an evidence of the purity of the principles of the anti-American party, must also be prepared to reason that the thousands and tens of thousands of European paupers who swarm the land, are more capable of self-government, more deeply imbued with the spirit of republicanism, more competent to perform the duties which the constitution and laws of the land require at the hands of every citizen, than those to the manor born; either these ignorant, vicious, besotted greasers, who have swelled to such an unprecedented extent the majority of the anti-American party in Bexar are wrong, or the seventy thousand intellectual, educated and refined Virginians, who supported the American ticket at the late elections in that State, are in error. Both cannot be right. . . .

It is impossible for the intellectual and reflecting portion of the American people to close their eyes to the fact that some unseen and dangerous element has been at work? Among these benighted people, more to be feared than any army in battle array, . . . a corrupt, sneaking and licentious priesthood, the most unscrupulous and corrupt that ever disgraced any land, have been actively engaged around the altars of their churches and at the firesides of their proselytes. . . . The worst passions and the silliest fears of the deluded horde of Mexican peons who populate to such a dangerous extent the county of Bexar, have been appealed to by a squad of black robed villians, who exercise over the minds of their miserable followers a despotism more absolute than that of any Turkish nobleman over those who people his seraglio.

In the hands of these priests, fellow-citizens, the ballot box has been placed in San Antonio, serpent-like have they entered into the jacals of their countrymen, and there hissed into the ears of the inmates, the mandates from which a Mexican has no appeal, and the consequence has been, that on election day a horde of political lepers have crawled to

the ballot box, and there nullified the votes of thousands of your countrymen, who have weighed well the principles in controversy. . . .

A victory—a signal victory has been gained in Comal and Bexar by the anti-Americans, but it is a conquest of might over right. It is a triumph of the guests over the host, it is the rout of the American by a foreign party—it is the political defeat of Texans by the very men whom their valor defeated on the ensanguined field of battle. . . .

Is there nothing to fear, American citizens, from the influence of foreigners, and the machinations of Roman Catholic priests?[45]

The editors of the *State Gazette* ably and pointedly disposed of these charges and denunciations. They condemned them as "untrue," "unchristian," and "uncharitable." They declared that the German vote of Comal and Medina was as unanimous as that of the Know-Nothings, of Grimes, Robertson, and Webberville, and that all who knew the German population were aware that they had in America three Protestants to every one Catholic, and three non-Catholic clergymen of German birth to every Catholic priest. Therefore, the *Gazette* remarked that it would be just as logical to attribute the Know-Nothing vote in Grimes to ministerial influence as to state that the Catholic clergy in Comal and Medina controlled the German vote. The *Gazette* asked:

Does the charge of the *Times* extend to the German Protestant clergy? And if so, has it been as potent for the Know-Nothings as against them? Does it suppose that all Protestant proselytes are free from the influence of their pastors? . . .

Suppose it be admitted that the Catholic Priests did advise their flocks not to vote for their own degradation and disfranchisement; and suppose such interference be morally reprehensible, how do they stand as compared with the protestant clergy of that same county and the country round about? How stood the Methodist preacher in San Antonio? How stood the whole protestant clergy of Travis, and Grimes counties? Have they not all, with two or three exceptions, united themselves with the dark-lantern party? . . .

Did not some of them on the day (election day), give their active influence by presiding at elections, and impertinently showing their own preferences? . . .

Who is President of the Grand Council of Know-Nothings in Texas? Who but a preacher of a numerous church? . . .

[45] Article reprinted in *State Gazette*, Aug. 18, 1855.

The charge that the proselytes of the Catholic Church are more under the influence of their priests than those of Protestants, remains to be proven. Be it so. The very fact that the voters had the wisdom to resist the assaults of Know-Nothingism upon civil and religious liberty, is the best evidence of their fitness for a Democratic government. . . .[46]

Shortly after the campaign of 1855, John A. Wilcox, a resident of San Antonio, commenting in a letter to a friend on the recent elections maintained that there were 10,000 foreign voters in the State, and that they had, with few exceptions, voted as a unit the anti-Know-Nothing ticket in the recent elections. Accordingly, he affirmed that Texas was completely under the control of foreigners, who were 90 per cent. abolitionists. He asserted that Northern abolition societies had established agencies among these foreigners to whom they sent by mail the *New York Tribune* and other abolition papers for gratuitous circulation.

Describing election day in San Antonio, he remarked that the Germans marched in procession through the city parading their flag, and chanting the German national airs; that the French followed, singing the Marseillaise; that the Catholic priest took the field openly against the Know-Nothing party and "threatened temporal, eternal and spiritual damnation to him who voted the American ticket"; and that as a result the Know-Nothing party received no Catholic vote.[47]

Again, the editors of the *Gazette* pointed out the incorrectness of these statements. In an editorial, Wilcox was asked to give his authority for his reporting that there were 10,000 voters of foreign birth in Texas, since the compendium of the United States Census showed that in 1850 there were in Texas only 16,774 foreigners, including both sexes and all ages. On pages 50 and 124 of this compendium the editors found a basis for estimating the total actual voters in that number. The census showed that about 40 per cent of the arrivals were females; that the foreign-born males of the United States of 21 years and over were put down at 60 per cent of the whole foreign-born males; and that only one-half of these were classed as voters. Upon this basis they calculated the

[46] *State Gazette*, Aug. 18, 1855.

[47] This letter was published in the *Confederate* (A. Know-Nothing paper) and reprinted in the *State Gazette*, Oct. 6, 1855.

number of actual foreign voters in Texas at 3,000. In like manner they examined his other statements and refuted them.

In disposing of the charge that the Catholics cast no votes for the Know-Nothing candidates the editorial was characteristically positive and plain:

> You banded yourselves together in secret conclave and swore terrible oaths not to support any Roman Catholic for office, not even a Protestant, if he had a Catholic wife. It was a decent sense of self-respect which caused the Catholics to refuse you their vote. You charged upon the Catholic priests a threat, which we ask you to fix upon any single Catholic Priest in Bexar or any other county in the State. If you can make good your allegations, do so. We call upon you to do it in justice to many respectable and honest men who are ministers of the Catholic Church; and whom your charge, as now unspecified, would cover with infamy. . . .[48]

Houston's Letter
Published During the Campaign of 1855

At the national convention of the Know-Nothing party held in Cincinnati in November, 1854, there were five men considered for the office of national president of the party: Sam Houston, of Texas; Winfield Scott, of New Jersey; Jacob Broome, of Pennsylvania; Millard Fillmore, of New York; and John M. Clayton, of Delaware. A delegate, writing from the convention to the office of the *New York Herald,* stated:

> The chances of Houston are deemed the best. He is considered an available man; . . . has, during the past year, organized upwards of four hundred and fifty local lodges, or councils; has plenty of military glory and romance; is a Western man living at the South, with a Northern and Eastern reputation lately acquired; and has been President of the Republic of Texas.[49]

Nevertheless, Houston's identification with this party was revealed in Texas only when, toward the close of the campaign of 1855, his open letter [50] containing an endorsement of Know-Nothing princi-

[48] *State Gazette,* Oct. 6, 1855.

[49] *New York Herald,* November 16, 1854, 1.

[50] Cf. the Appendix for text of the letter. Only its salient features will be treated here.

ples was published in an extra of the *State Times* without any editorial comment.[51]

He maintained that he purposely delayed the publication of his opinions so as not to be accused of influencing the elections. However, his party sentiments were circulated throughout the State just in time to operate upon voters, but afforded no time for the correction of false statements either through the press or on the stump. The office of the *State Gazette* received numerous reports recounting the extensiveness of its circulation, especially in the populous districts. On election day fifty copies of it were distributed in the town of Marshall alone.[52]

In the opening section of this letter Houston advocated the existence of secret societies, for he considered them the enemies of despots and tyrants. He asserted that the Cincinnati Society was a secret and purely political organization whose membership, after the revolutionary heroes had died, was limited to native Americans, and that Washington at the time of his death was president of that society. He then asked the anti-Know-Nothings what they thought of that "scrap of history," and what dangers had grown out of that secret organization.

The editors of the *State Gazette* (August 25, 1855) answered promptly. Quoting extracts from the correspondence between Washington and Jefferson (contained in the latter's works) they showed that Washington declined the presidency of the Cincinnati Society, and that the Baron Steuben was then appointed. They, moreover, proved that Washington, owing to the unpopularity of the society, was anxious to suppress it. Furthermore, by citations from the writings of Jefferson they exposed the evils accruing from its existence.

In attempting to identify Washington with secret political associations, Houston affirmed that, from his knowledge of the man's character—the sacrifices which he made for his country, his fervent patriotism, and his preference for everything American—he believed that if Washington were living, he would cheerfully sanction the principles of the Know-Nothing party.

The anti-Know-Nothings interpreted this assertion as an insinua-

[51] *State Gazette*, Aug. 1, 1855. [52] *State Gazette*, Aug. 25, 1855.

tion that Washington sympathized with projects which tended to limit the political rights of Catholics. Such allegations, they persisted, showed an utter disregard of historical facts. They referred to Washington's correspondence in which they found true sentiments of religious toleration (*State Gazette,* Sept. 15, 1855). They cited his letter of May, 1789, addressed to the General Committee of the United Baptist churches in Virginia in reference to affixing his signature to the Constitution,[53] and, in addition to this, they cited another letter written in 1789 to the Quakers,[54] as well as a certain letter, written in January, 1793, addressed to the new church in Baltimore (sect unspecified).[55]

Houston maintained that President Jackson as well as Washing-

[53] "If I could have entertained the slightest apprehension that the constitution framed by the convention where I had the honor to preside might possibly endanger the religious rights of an ecclesiastical society, certainly I never would have placed ›y signature to it; and if I could not conceive that the general government might even be so administered as to render the liberty of conscience insecure, I beg you will be persuaded that no one would be more zealous than myself to establish effectual barriers against the horrors of spiritual tyranny, and every species of religious persecution. For you doubtless remember I have often expressed my sentiments that any man conducting himself as a good citizen, and being accountable to God alone for his religious opinions, ought to be protected in worshipping the Deity according to the dictates of his own conscience."

[54] "The liberty enjoyed by the people of the States, of worshipping Almighty God agreeably to their conscience, is not only among the choicest of their blessings but also of their rights. While men perform their social duties faithfully, they do all that society or the State can, with propriety expect and remain responsible to their maker, for the religions and modes of faith which they prefer or profess."

[55] "We have abundant reasons to rejoice that, in this land the light of truth and reason have triumphed over the power of bigotry and superstition, and that every person may worship God according to the dictates of his own heart. In this enlightened age, and in this land of equal liberty, it is our boast, that a man's religious tenets will not cause him to forfeit the protection of the laws, nor deprive him of the right of attaining and holding the highest offices that are known in the United States."

The authenticity of these documents was verified by comparing them with the letters in the Writings of Washington by Jared Sparks, Vol. 12, pp. 155, 168, and 202, respectively.

ton, were he then living, would have sanctioned and advocated the principles of the Know-Nothing party. The anti-Know-Nothings stigmatized this declaration as a slander upon Jackson's character, and defied Houston to give reasons for his assertion. They pointed to Jackson's messages and speeches as being permeated with noble sentiments, and to Jackson as a man beloved by all sects—Catholics as well as Protestants. They emphatically declared that the Know-Nothings were obligated in accordance with their oaths to refuse to appoint Catholics to political offices, and to remove those whom they found occupying positions of honor or trust. Again, they challenged Houston and his political party to point out an instance in the careers of Washington or of Jackson where either acted in accordance with the principles of exclusive privileges and proscription. They cited Jackson's appointment of Chief Justice Taney, a Catholic, to the Supreme Court of the United States as an evidence of his unprejudiced and tolerant spirit.[56]

Houston ascribed the rise of the Know-Nothing party to: (1) the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act; (2) the selection of the President's Cabinet; (3) the report that an agreement had been made by a Catholic bishop (Archbishop Hughes) with General Pierce during the campaign of 1852, in accordance with which the latter was to receive the Catholic vote and in return, should he be elected, he was to give a position in his Cabinet to a Catholic; (4) the selection of foreigners as ambassadors and ministers to foreign courts; (5) the arrival of paupers and criminals in large numbers from European countries; (6) the "threats made in Catholic newspapers and periodicals." And he politically identified himself as a Jacksonian Democrat.

The anti-Know-Nothings, objecting to the use of this appellation as an attempt to deceive the unwary, contrasted the political creed of Jackson as embodied in the Constitution [57] of his adopted State,

[56] *State Gazette*, Sept. 1, 1855.

[57] Andrew Jackson represented Davidson County in the Constitional convention in Tennessee, in 1796, and was a member of the committee which drafted the Declaration of Rights. An extract from that document says: "That all men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own conscience; that no man can, of right, be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or to maintain any minister against his consent; that No

and that of Houston as incorporated in the sworn obligations [58] of a Know-Nothing.[59]

Houston had voted against the Kansas-Nebraska Bill in 1854, and in his letter he attributed the revival of the slavery agitation to the passage of that act.[60]

Houston maintained that the conferring of the suffrage on those who were not natives rested with Congress.

The anti-Know-Nothings protested against this doctrine; they

Human Authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the Rights of Conscience; and that no preference shall ever be given by law to any Religious Establishment or Mode or Worship.

"That No Religious Test shall ever be required as a qualification for any office or public trust under this state."

[58] For the Know-Nothing Oaths Cf. Appendix, 193.

[59] *State Gazette*, Sept. 1, 1855.

[60] This attitude toward the bill was typical of that of the Southern Know-Nothings. In Texas, as we have seen, since the beginning of American colonization there had been an intimate relation between nativism and slavery; but in the United States these issues were unrelated until 1854. During the pendency of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, John Clayton, of Delaware, introduced in the Senate an amendment which provided that immigrants from foreign countries who had merely declared their intention to become naturalized citizens should not be voters in these territories. The amendment passed the Senate by a vote of 23 to 21; the 23 affirmative votes coming from slave states and the 21 negative, from free states. The House passed the bill, but rejected the amendment. On being returned to the Senate it passed unamended. (*Congressional Globe*, Vol. 23, 297 ff.) This act was popular with the Democrats, but it was regarded with disfavor by the Know-Nothings. The *Mobile Advertiser*, May 28, 1854, condemned the exultation of some Southern Democrats because the Clayton amendment was tabled in the House. *The Texas State Times*, the chief organ of the Know-Nothings in the State, alluding to the Kansas-Nebraska Act said:

"A majority of foreigners can make Kansas and Nebraska free Territories or free states. A sufficiency of foreign votes to turn the scale between the anti-slavery and the pro-slavery parties can do it. If the members of the Territorial legislature of Kansas and Nebraska pass laws prohibiting slavery in the Territories, the Southerner is shut out—he cannot emigrate to them with his property. Slavery would therefore be inevitably prohibited in the State Constitutions when they shall be admitted into the Union. All these results are within the reach of foreigners to achieve."—*State Times*, March 1, 1856.

believed with Justice Story that the people of the United States had already decided that question.[61]

Houston denied that the Know-Nothing party proscribed Catholics and foreigners, and claimed that "Protestants and Americans" had become alarmed at the "threats and denunciations" published in the Catholic press. He further added that the aim of the party was not "to put down Catholics, but to prevent Catholics from putting down Protestants," and asserted that they did not intend to interfere with Catholic worship, but, because Catholics acknowledged the temporal power of the Pope, the American party was unwilling to bestow political power on them.

The *State Gazette,* September 1, 1855, referring to the passage in his letter dealing with this topic, remarked:

"General Houston has not, nor was it his intention, to state fairly the design of the Know-Nothing party. It did not suit him to give the facts from the Constitution of his party, nor to say that whatever may be asserted in the platform, these obligations to persecute Catholics for their religious opinions, are sworn to by the taking of solemn oaths." Furthermore, it stated that there were "inside principles" and "outside principles" which were essentially different, and the outward principles were put forward to delude the people into the idea that there was no hostility to Catholics.

Anti-Catholic Propaganda

During the campaign bitter anti-Catholic hostility was manifested in the press and in stump speeches. Incriminating charges too rabid to be accepted as historical facts by the men of even average education were made. A typical example is taken from the *State Times,* June 2, 1855:

They are not the philosophers and men of national progress but the

[61] They quoted Story as saying:

"Every constitution of Government in these United States has assumed as a fundamental principle, the right of the people of the State, to alter, abolish and modify the form of its own government, according to the sovereign pleasure of the people. In fact the people of each state have gone much further and settled a far more critical question, by deciding who shall be the voters, entitled to approve and reject the constitution framed by a delegate body under their direction."—*State Gazette,* May 24, 1856.

ministers of the Roman Church, that dishonored mankind by wholesale butcheries of their fellow beings; who delivered to the poignard (*sic*) of their emissaries, or to the flames of their piles, some of the best and most meritorious men, on account of their speculative opinions. The philosophers and friends of science did not arm the West against the East, one hemisphere against another, nor did they promote the Crusades, the proscription of the Albigenses and Waldenses, the slaughter of St. Bartholomew, the massacres in Ireland, the murders of kings and the desolation of the New World.

We would respectfully ask the noble prelates and all the priests of the Roman Church who are the authors of all these atrocities? But even for the scandals and trespasses which occasionally take place in ordinary circumstances; we can trace their causes to the perfidious insinuations and ill consequences of the clerical education. We promised to prove by accurate statistical data the proportion of crimes between Catholic and Protestant countries; here will our readers see the lamentable truth of our statement. For every 100 children born from legitimate fathers, London has 4 foundlings; Paris, 48; Brussels, 53; Munich, 91; Vienna, 118; and Rome, 243. Thus the legal morality of the heretical London, compared with that of the Holy City of Rome, is in proportion of 80 to 1.

Probably in retaliation for the publication of the Know-Nothing oaths, the *Texas Presbyterian* published bogus anathemas and oaths of the Catholic Church. The following was published in the *Texas Presbyterian,* September 15, 1855, as the official anathema of excommunication pronounced against those leaving it to join Protestantism:

By the authority of God Almighty, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and the undefiled Virgin Mary. . . . May he be damned—We excommunicate and anathematize him from the threshold of the Holy Church. . . . We sequester him, that he may be tormented, disposed, and be delivered over with Dathan and Abiram, and with those who say unto the Lord: Depart from us, we desire none of thy ways; as a fire is quenched with water, so let the light of him be put out forever, unless it shall repent him and make satisfaction. Amen!

May the Father, who created man, curse him! May the Son, who suffered for us, curse him! May the Holy Ghost, who is poured out in baptism curse him! May the Holy Cross, which Christ, for our salvation, triumphing over his enemies, ascendant (*sic*), curse him! . . . May all the saints from the beginning of the world to everlasting who are found

to be beloved of God, damn him! May he be damned where he is, whether in the house, or in alley, or in the woods. . . . May he be cursed in eating and drinking. . . . May he be cursed in all the faculties of his body! . . .

The following was declared to be the oath taken by a bishop at his consecration:

I, . . ., elect of the church of N——, from henceforth will be faithful and obedient to St. Peter the Apostle, and to the Holy Roman Church, and to our lord the lord N——, Pope N——, and to his successors canonically coming in. I will neither advise, consent, nor do anything that they may lose life or member, or that their persons may be seized, or hands anywise laid on them, or any injuries offered to them, under any pretense whatever. The Counsel which they shall intrust me withal, by themselves, their messengers or letters, I will not knowingly reveal to any to their prejudice. I will help them to defend and keep the Roman Papacy and the royalties of St. Peter, saving my order, against all men. The legate of the Apostolic See, going and coming I will honorably treat, and help in his necessities. *Hfretics (sic), schismatics, and rebels to our said Lord, or His aforesaid successors, I will, to the utmost of my power, persecute and oppose.* I will come to a council, when I am called, unless, I be hindered by a canonical impediment. . . .

The oaths of lay organizations, made up exclusively of Catholics, but not affiliated with the Church and even under the ban of the Church, were published. The following was said to be the oath taken by the Irish Ribbonmen:

I . . . swear by Saints Peter and Paul . . . to be always faithful to the society of Ribbonmen; to keep and conceal all its secrets, and its words of order; to be always ready to execute the commands of my superior officers, and, as far as it shall lay in my power, to extirpate all heretics, and all the Protestants, and to walk in their blood to the knee. . . .

An article, denouncing the Church as a despotic institution, was published in the same paper, September 6, 1856:

This system (Romanism) teaches that all power, spiritual or temporal, resides exclusively in the Pope, making him king of kings and head of the church, God's vice-gerent, . . . The inquisition now, with

opportunity and power, is the same as it was, only at present waiving arrogant claims, pains and penalties, as a matter of policy and necessity; but ever ready, with a return of privilege and position, to enforce the same murderous supremacy, because any means are right, and sanctified to the accomplishment of the great end of Roman Catholicism. Having never disavowed such right, it only remains to regain power to exercise over creatures the same terrible and supreme control, mental and physical, as shall enforce, in church and state, the same arrogant claims peculiar to the Roman Hierarchy. Where Rome reigns, dissent from Rome is death. This is no less true from her uttered sentiments, than from the testimony of history. There has never been in the nature and genius of her system, anything compatible with civil or religious liberty or free institutions, and there never will be, if she possesses the power to enforce and maintain her own principles. From beginning to end the Romish system, in its temporal or spiritual operations, is nothing short of absolute despotism, without any intelligent piety, individual responsibility, free discussion, a free press, freedom of opinion, or an open Bible. Intolerance is its first and leading idea, its greatest boast. . . .

The Catholic Church was charged not only with interference in politics but with conspiracy for the destruction of American political institutions, and the actual strength of Catholics politically was grossly exaggerated. The following article taken from *Texas State Times,* September 15, 1855, is an evidence of such charges:

But it is a notorious fact that the Monarchs of Europe and the Pope of Rome are at this very moment plotting our destruction and threatening the extinction of our political, civil and religious institutions. We have the best reason for believing that corruption has found its way into our Executive Chamber, and that our Executive head is tainted with the infectious venom of Catholicism. It has been repeatedly charged that President Pierce actually bargained with the Catholic clergy, prior to his election to the office of Chief Magistrate of the United States, for the Catholic vote, well knowing that this anti-republican sect held the balance of power in many of the States, and to secure the Catholic vote was to secure his election, promising them a Cabinet officer and a liberal share of Executive patronage in return. . . . The Catholic Clergy are at this time watching the United States Senate and overseeing the appointing power, to see that the President redeems his pledge and gives them their share of offices, that their dominions do not suffer. This was beautifully illustrated in the appointment of the

French Catholic Soulé, Minister Plenipotentiary and Envoy Extraordinary to the Court of Spain, when the whole United States was aggrieved and insulted at the insolent treatment of the American flag by the Spanish Government. They had imprisoned our citizens, robbed them on the high seas, and actually murdered our Crittenden in cold blood; . . . Cuba herself had invited our brethren to come and help them break the fetters of Popedom and lead them to freedom. Bishop Hughes tells our President, you must not interfere with our dominions; send a Catholic Minister to Spain—a foreigner; and in compliance with his pledges to the Catholic Church the President sent out Pierre Soulé. He is instructed by Bishop Hughes to defeat the acquisition of Cuba by the United States, and to settle our differences with Spain at the dictation of Popedom; . . .

An evidence of hostility to the spread of Catholicity in the United States through immigration and missionary activities, as well as an example of one of the fundamental political charges hurled against the Catholic Church by the Know-Nothing party is found in the following citations taken from the *Texas State Times,* September 15, 1855:

The Roman Catholics are the best organized and most powerful sect in all Christendom: their numerical force is now put down at the overwhelming number of 155,000,000 in the whole world, greatly outnumbering all Protestantism; and they are now plotting the subversion of our civil and religious liberty. The Pope has recently sent his embassador (*sic*) of state to this country, on a secret commission, the effect of which is an extraordinary boldness of the Catholic Church throughout the United States in the propagation of their dangerous creed—The twenty-five arch-Bishops and Bishops in the States are boldly waging war on our civil, political and religious institutions, and do not blush to justify and propagate all the enormities and bloodstained doctrines of the leaden ages.

These minions of the Pope are boldly insulting our Senators; reprimanding our Statesmen; propagating the adulterous union of Church and state; aspersing with foul calumny all governments but Catholic; and spewing out the bitterest execrations on all Protestantism. The Catholics in the United States receive from abroad more than $200,000 annually, for the propagation of their creed. Add to this the vast revenue collected here; they usually tax their laity at the rate of one dollar per month. There are at least two millions of Catholics here, who would pay at the above rate of taxation, the enormous sum of

$24,000,000 annually This revenue must be increased in proportion to the immense Catholic immigration to this country, which, in the last two years, has been more than 300,000 annually; and a certainty of a heavy increase in this kind of immigration for the next five years, and what will be our condition? . . .

For a sample of Catholic misrule, the Know-Nothings pointed to Mexico, which they characterized a republic in name, with not even a shadow of freedom:[62]

Look to poor, priest-ridden and down-trodden Mexico, our neighbors. For more than two hundred years, she has groaned under the iron rod of Catholic misrule, and goaded by her Priests under her intolerable burdens. . . . They are called a Republic, but they have only the name, and not even the shadow of freedom. A Catholic hierarchy is grafted on their tree of liberty, and all its fruit is anarchy, intolerance and superstition; their elections are a most perfect farce; their offices are sold by the clergy to the highest bidder. . . . All a man has to do in Mexico to be President, is to buy up the clergy and his office is sure. The ballot-box is the merchandise of the clergy, and the people are bought and sold at the ballot box like bank stock in our markets; and the clergy fatten on the spoils, and the people are all virtually the slaves of a corrupt clergy. In the United States the Catholics all vote as their clergy dictate; and the clergy are dictated to by money and power. And even here the Catholics hold the balance of power in many of the States and in the United States; and political demagogues are now bartering for and buying the Catholic vote—for all he has to do is to pay the priests and promise them power and influence, and he gets their votes if no one outbids him, and he pledges himself to favor Catholic influence. . . .

Anti-Catholic hostility was also manifested in the field of education. Governor Pease in his message to the Legislature in November, 1855, pointed out what he considered were defects in the school law of 1854, and showed that it was not adapted to the conditions then existing in Texas. The Governor, after calling attention to the annual reports for 1854 and 1855 of the State Treasurer, who was ex-officio superintendent of the common schools, remarked:

These reports show that but few of the counties have organized and established schools as required by this law; in most of them the popu-

[62] *Texas State Times*, September 15, 1855.

lation is sparsely scattered over a great extent of territory, which cannot be divided into districts containing a sufficient number of children for the maintenance of a school, without making the district so large that the school must necessarily be at an inconvenient distance from a large portion of the scholars; this, without doubt, has prevented and will continue to prevent, the execution of a law like the present until our population becomes more dense.

He then recommended that the law be amended (1) by imposing heavy penalties upon assessors and collectors who should fail to make within the prescribed time a return of the number of school children in their respective counties, and (2) by declaring all schools in the State to be public schools, "the funds distributed to each county, to be disbursed under the orders of the county court, to such teachers as the parents and guardians of the children "might" choose to employ for their education." [63]

The Governor's recommendation was given consideration in the legislative session which followed. However, the opposition to granting state support to sectarian schools was so strong that the law remained unamended. Nevertheless, the *State Times,* May 17, 1856, contained an open letter written by a Know-Nothing and addressed to Governor Pease. The latter was accused in this letter of aiding the Jesuits to convert the children of Texas to the Catholic faith. After quoting the objectionable passage in the message relative to education, the *Times* correspondent added:

If I was assured that there was as much Catholic influence in this State as in some others, I would come to the conclusion from this part of the message that you were under the influence of the disciples of Loyola. But charity forces me to conclude otherwise, and that the reason why we find the above recommendation is because you did not look at the subject in all its bearings.

The latter then states that the carrying out of the Governor's wishes would be fraught with many evil consequences to public education: [64]

Jesuit education with its complicated apparatus has been the curse

[63] *Official Records of the Executive Office,* E. M. Pease, Administration, 319-352.

[64] *State Gazette,* May 31, 1856.

of all other lands politically and morally, and an open door to the ruin of Government. Let us examine this subject, every one setting up a school would draw a *per capita* from the State fund. Teachers are abundant in the Old World. The Leopold foundation at Vienna, the propaganda at Rome, and the Jesuit Missionary Society at Lyons, France, are all manufacturing school teachers. The Jesuites Solitaires, under the name of Sisters of Charity, Sisters of the Sacred Heart, etc., etc., would swarm among us as in other states of the Union. There would soon be a dozen schools where there should be one, and all located so as best to serve the plans of the Roman Catholic Church. The consequences would be that easily our American children would be drawn in, and obtain a Roman Catholic education, an education preparing the American mind for the world of despotism.

This writer was ably answered by the editor of the *State Gazette,* who cited Henry Clay as saying that there is " nothing in the Catholic religion unfavorable to freedom, nor anything incompatible with the highest degree of national prosperity." In confirmation of his assertion that under the existing conditions, it was utterly impossible for the Catholics in the United States to obtain a monopoly of the government, he compared the strength of the Catholic Church in the United States with that of the combined non-Catholic denominations.[65]

Many of the attacks made upon the Catholic Church were repelled by the anti-Know-Nothing press. Thus the *Galveston News* condemned the Houston *Panaplist,* a sectarian sheet, for originating the circulation of the bogus form of excommunication, and traced the latter back to its author, Lawrence Sterne, and to its source—a " notorious work " called *Tristram Shandy.* In the name of Justice the *News* urged the editor of that paper to undo the wrong by making the necessary corrections. At this same time it also published a translation of the genuine form of excommunication as given in the works of Bishop England.[66]

The charge that Catholics recognized the civil jurisdiction of the Pope was refuted by the publication of the interrogatories relative to papal temporal power, which William Pitt, as Premier of England, sent in 1788 to several of the Catholic universities of Europe

[65] *State Gazette,* May 31, 1856.
[66] *Galveston News,* Oct. 2, 1855.

as well as the answers given by each of these universities.[67] The one bearing directly upon the point at issue was:

Has the Pope or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, any civil authority, power, jurisdiction or preëminence whatsoever within the realm of England?

The first answer came from the Faculty of Divinity of the University of Paris:

Neither the Pope, nor the Cardinals, nor any body of men, nor any other persons of the Church of Rome, hath any civil authority, civil power, civil jurisdiction, or civil preëminence whatever in any Kingdom; and consequently none in the Kingdom of England; by reason or virtue of any authority, power, jurisdiction or preëminence by divine institution inherent in, or granted, or by any other means belonging to the Pope or the Church of Rome. This doctrine the Sacred Faculty of Divinity of Paris has always held, and upon every occasion maintained, and upon every occasion has rigidly prescribed the contrary doctrines from her schools.

The universities of Douay, Louvain, Alcala, and Salamanca gave answers of somewhat similar import.[68]

In addition, a quotation from the Pastoral letter [69] of the Eighth Provincial Council of the Catholic Church held at Baltimore, May 1855, was cited to show the nature of the allegiance which Catholics owe to the Pope:

To the general and State Governments you owe allegiance in all that regards the civil order: the authorities of the Church challenge your obedience in the things of salvation. We have no need of pressing this distinction which you fully understand, and constantly observe. You know that we have uniformly taught you both publicly and privately, to perform all the duties of good citizens, and that we have never exacted of you, as we ourselves have never made even to the highest ecclesiastical

[67] A reprint of the documents containing the opinions of these universities on the temporal power of the pope is given in the Appendix (p. 287) of *The Book of the Roman Catholic Church* by Charles Butler, Baltimore, 1834.

[68] *Texas Republican,* Sept. 1, 1855.

[69] The authenticity of this document was verified by comparing it with the Pastoral. Eighth Provincial Council of Baltimore, 1855, 15-16.

authority, any engagements inconsistent with the duties we owe to the country and its laws. On every occasion we have avowed these principles and even in our communication to the late Pontiff, we rejected as a calumny the imputation that we were in civil matters subject to his authority.[70]

Excerpts were also cited from the works of prominent bishops. Bishop England was quoted as saying:

Let the Pope and Cardinals, and all the powers of the Catholic world united, make the least encroachment on that constitution (federal), we will protect it with our lives. Summon a general council—let that council interfere in the mode of our electing but an assistant to a turnkey of a prison—we deny its rights; we reject its usurpation. Let that council lay a tax of one cent only upon any of our churches—we will not pay it. Yet, we are most obedient papists.[71]

Bishop Spalding was next cited:

But the Papacy invested itself with temporal powers; and in the Middle Ages, it claimed the right to depose princes, and to absolve their subjects from the oath of allegiance. Be it so; what then? Was this accession of temporay power ever viewed as an essential prerogative of the Papacy—or was it not considered merely as an accidental appendage; the creature of peculiar circumstances. Are there any examples of such alleged usurpations during the first ten centuries of its history? Has this power been exercised, or even claimed, by the Roman Pontiffs for the last three centuries? If these two facts are undoubted—as they certainly are—then how maintain that a belief in the Papacy involves a recognition of its temporay power? Was the latter ever a doctrine of the Catholic Church? If it was, where is the proof; where the Church definition that made it a doctrine? Did not five leading Catholic Universities, when officially called on by Mr. Wm. Pitt, Prime Minister of Great Britain, solemnly and unanimously disclaim this opinion, and maintain the precise contrary. Did the Catholic Church; Did the Pope ever rebuke them for the disclaimer? Do not

[70] The *Texas Republican*, Sept. 1, 1855.

[71] The Authenticity of this citation was verified by reference to the Works of Rt. Rev. John England edited by Rev. I. A. Reynolds, Baltimore, 1849. Quotation in Volume II, 251.

Catholics all over the world now almost unanimously disclaim it? And are they the less Catholic for this?—*Evidence of Catholicity*, 337.[72]

The Interval Prior to the Presidential Campaign of 1856

Following the campaign of 1855 both parties held barbecues at Austin. The anti-Know-Nothings' celebration at which every section of the State was represented, was held November 2 and 3. On this occasion spirited and impressive speeches making bold and constant attacks upon the creed and principles of the Know-Nothing party were delivered. The following resolution offered by W. S. Oldham was adopted:

> Resolved by the Democracy of Texas in mass meeting assembled, That we recommend to the Democracy of each county to thoroughly organize the party in their midst, and prepare for the first note of battle for the Presidency in 1856; and that no county of the State suffer itself to be unrepresented in the next State convention which we propose shall be held in the City of Austin on the 16th day of January next.[73]

The Know-Nothing party's celebration was held three weeks later. Sam Houston was the central figure. In the speech which he delivered on this occasion, he reiterated all the Know-Nothing principles contained in his celebrated letter. He vindicated his course in the United States Senate; defended his negative vote on the Kansas-Nebraska bill; denounced President Pierce and affirmed that the Kansas-Nebraska bill was a project of Pierce to secure reëlection, and expressed his great apprehension of foreigners. In addition to the foregoing, he condemned the Senate for extending an invitation to Kossuth to tread the floor hallowed by the footsteps of Washington, and condemned the Democratic party for its naturalization policy; stigmatizing immigrants in general as outcasts of European prisons, he furthermore condemned the administration for appointing foreigners to diplomatic posts abroad. He endeavored to arouse a personal sympathy in his behalf by alluding

[72] *Texas Republican*, Sept. 1, 1855.
This page reference to Spalding's book is incorrect. It should read 377-378.

[73] *State Gazette*, Nov. 10, 1855.

to the part which he played in the Texan Revolution. He then denounced the Pope and the Catholic Church in general:

Have not Catholics cursed and threatened us? Are not their doctrines opposed to republican institutions? We act upon the principles of resistance and not aggression. I will resist the political influence of the Pope and Priest as long as I have the rights of a freeman and the power of reason. I will resist the potency of the Pope whether it exhibits itself in the meek and humble air of Jesuitism, or in the bulls of excommunication. Is there a spot of earth where the Catholic religion prevails that liberty exists? Look at France in the terrors of revolution. Thrice has she thrown off the chains of despotism and thrice has priestcraft riveted the chains upon her. It is said that there is no government on earth that has universal freedom except America. England has comparative freedom. She has her Magna Charter. The Pope denounced the nobility that wrung that charter from the British king, and excommunicated them from the privileges of the Church. The Magna Charter was the corner stone of American liberty. Let us hold sacred . . . the right of trial by jury, the elective franchise and habeas Corpus rights enjoyed in no countries except England and America. Catholicity and liberty cannot exist in the same government. It must be all Catholicism or all liberty—The moment we yield to the one we resign the other. . . .[74]

The Standard, a Democratic paper, refuted these statements by publishing the following:

The first question is of a very general character. It would be hard to answer. We presume that people in all the governments of Europe have cursed us; and some have invoked blessings upon us. The allusion to the French Revolution, and the question whether there is a spot of earth where the Catholic religion prevails, that there is liberty—merely serve to show again what is apparent throughout the speech, that the General is not a very well read man, and has the same sort of disregard for book learning that Jack Cade had. France in the terrors of the Revolution had, by public spectacle, officially deposed the religion of the State, and inaugurated in its place the Goddess of Reason; so that, that reference fails. In answer to the enquiry about lands where liberty prevails, we may answer that it prevails in Switzerland and San Marino, and that the religion of the last is Catholic, and that of half the other is also; with the marked peculiarity, that the Catholic

[74] *State Gazette,* Dec. 8, 1855.

Cantons, are the most purely Democratic. Does not the Senator know what Venice was, the "greatest and mightiest of the Republics which rose when Europe began to emerge from the darkness of the feudal ages," and which so remained until Napoleon bound her, hand and foot, and delivered her over to Austria. Does he know, that the same Venice has made a mighty and protracted effort in late years, Catholic as she is, to reëstablish the republic, from which she has only been prevented by foreign arms. He does not seem to know that as early as the twelfth and thirteen centuries, the Free Frisons and the Flemish, who were Catholics, had essentially free Government, under the Legislative control of their Councils, or Guilds, whose acts no man could veto or contravene. No! we are satisfied the Senator knows little of this; . . .[75]

Scarcely had the political excitement incident to the campaign of 1855 subsided, when both parties began to prepare for the coming presidential campaign. As party organization was considered the first essential step in the remote preparation, the *State Gazette* in its editorial section continued to urge the counties that were still unorganized, to form Democratic associations. Accordingly, in the fall of 1855, a number of counties assembled in mass meeting and organized themselves into political units. These associations, although all had the same aim, the permanent ascendancy of the Democratic party, varied somewhat in organization. In Rusk County the officers consisted of a president, 2 vice-presidents and 2 secretaries; in Anderson County of a president, 10 vice-presidents, and 2 secretaries. Fayette County had a Democratic committee made up of one member from each precinct in the county. The duty of this committee was to call a meeting of the Democrats in their respective districts whenever the interests of the party demanded it. In addition it had a committee consisting of one member from each civil district The members of this committee were to canvass their respective districts and to ascertain who would be the most suitable persons for county officers. Besides Democratic associations, some counties had vigilance committees, whose duties were general in character. The duty of the Cass County committee for instance, was to further the movement against Know-Nothingism and Abolitionism; that of the Freestone County committee was to act in concert with the Democratic association. Other

[75] *The Standard*, January 12, 1856.

counties had central or corresponding committees. Comal County, for example, appointed a committee of three to correspond with central committees in other counties.

One of the first meetings of the season on record was that held by the Democracy of Nueces County. In addition to organizing themselves politically, they drew up a set of resolutions which they recommended to the consideration of the various county Democratic associations as the basis of a state platform to be adopted at the coming state convention. These resolutions endorsed the Baltimore platform of 1852, and the administration of Pierce, and denounced the proscriptive doctrines of Know-Nothingism.[76]

A meeting of the Democrats of Leon County, October 3, organized a Democratic association; appointed delegates to the State convention; congratulated Democracy on its success in the recent elections; condemned secret political societies; adopted as its motto "equal and exact justice to all men of whatever birth, religion or persuasion"; approved of Senator Rusk's attitude towards Southern interests, and recommended him for reëlection to the United States Senate:[77]

Resolved, That we hail with sincere satisfaction the recent brilliant victories of the Democratc party over Know-Nothingism in the States of Virginia, Tennessee, Alabama, North Carolina and Texas, and we recur to them as renewed evidence that the people of the South are yet true to the principles of religious and political freedom.

2. That we believe all secret political societies dangerous in their tendencies, as especially so, when their members are bound by oaths, to subordination, such oath-bound organizations being calculated to destroy the freedom of individual suffrage, and to establish in our midst a great irresponsible central political despotism.

3. That all proscription from office, on account of the accident of birth, or of religious belief, is a species of intolerance and persecution, anti-democratic, and in no way worthy of toleration by the people who have declared all men are born with equal political rights, and that the freedom of the press, of speech and of conscience are rights sacred and inviolate, in the person of every freeman.

4. That our motto is equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever birth, religion or persuasion; and that we here declare our enduring

[76] *State Gazette*, Sept. 8, 1855. [77] *State Gazette*, Oct. 20, 1855.

opposition to any party that attempts to create political differences founded upon birth, nation or religion, and which seeks political preferment by appealing to the prejudices of nation or race, believing such a party to be dangerous to the peace of the country, destructive of the perpetuity of our free institutions, and calculated by its teachings to produce such scenes of bloodshed and murder as have recently been witnessed in the City of Louisville.

5. That the misrepresentations and concealments that have characterized the short history of the Know-Nothing party, and the course pursued by its orators and leaders, we view as a matter of patriotic and most serious alarm, tending, as it does, so rapidly to lower the standard of political morality and to inaugurate into the political code, as orthodox, the maxim that the means, however base, are justified by the end.

7. That we fully and emphatically approve of the political course of Hon. Thos. J. Rusk, and cheerfully recommend his re-election to the United States Senate.

9. That in view of the rapid growth of this new party, its novel, proscriptive, intolerant, anti-democratic, and dangerous doctrines, we deem it our duty to speak out our opposition to it in every shape and form, and to urge the people everywhere to organize to oppose it.

The Democrats of Washington County assembled at Brenham, October 6, 1855, organized a Democratic association; appointed delegates to the State Democratic Convention; pledged their loyalty to the anti-abolitionists and anti-Know-Nothings of the North; condemned secret political meetings and the advocating of the religious test as a requirement for office:[78]

Whereas, The recent elections in this and in other States, have demonstrated the fact that a dangerous organization exists throughout the Union; the tendency of whose principles and practices, if successfully carried out, is to subvert the liberties of the people. And whereas, the Democratic party of Washington County, deem it their right and their duty to oppose by all legitimate measures the success of the party familiarly called Know-Nothings. Therefore,

Resolved 3, That we cherish the warmest feeling of regard and respect for the true-hearted men of the North, who have maintained the rights of the South, and who have boldly opposed the mischievous schemes of Freesoilers, Abolitionists and Know-Nothings.

Resolved 4, That a party based upon correct principles, does not need

[78] *State Gazette*, Oct. 27, 1855.

the aid of secrecy to ensure its success; and we condemn the practice of secret meetings for the purpose of achieving any object connected with politics.

Resolved 5, That no freeman who has a proper appreciation of his rights and duties, can submit to be bound by oaths to the support of measures or men.

Resolved 6, That under our free government where all religions are tolerated, no religious test can be required as a qualification for the enjoyment of political rights; and any party which attempts directly or indirectly to abridge the enjoyment of these rights is wrong in principle and will lead by its doctrines to the subversion of the Constitution and the destruction of the government.

Resolved 7, That the present laws upon the subject of naturalization, are sufficient to accomplish the object intended by Congress and by the people, and require in our opinion no amendment.

Resolved 9, That we recommend to the Legislature at its next regular session the re-election of General Rusk to the Senate of the United States.

In McLennan County the Know-Nothings had been surprisingly successful in the campaign of 1855. Their victory had been due partly to the fact that the Democrats were unorganized. The latter, realizing this, took immediate steps to organize a Democratic association. On October 20 a county meeting was held at the town of Waco to appoint delegates to a State Convention. In its resolutions it expressed its uncompromising hostility to all secret political institutions; it appealed to all anti-Know-Nothings to join the Democratic party; it entreated the Democrats who had joined the Know-Nothings to return to their former political alignment; it commended the political career of Senator Rusk and condemned the free-soil vote of Houston on the Kansas-Nebraska Act, and his affiliation with the Know-Nothing party:[79]

The democratic party of the County of McLennan being desirous to testify their confidence in, and adherence to the well tried principles of democratic faith; and believing that the future welfare of the State materially depends upon a thorough and complete organization of the party therein; and that the cause of civil and religious liberty, as expounded by the fathers of the Republic in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, is now being

[79] *State Gazette*, Oct. 27, 1855.

seriously threatened by a combination of the fragments of faction throughout the Union, which under the specious and hypocritical name of "American party", is seeking, by means of secret-oath-bound principles, administered in midnight cabals, to ride into power upon the ruins of republicanism; and that the danger which thus insiduously threatens the perpetuity of our liberal institutions, can only be averted by the active, energetic and undivided coöperation of the National Democracy, to the administration of whose principles the country is alone indebted for its past prosperity and its present proud position among the nations of the earth, and to whom alone it may look in the future for the maintenance of those invaluable rights, which, secured and sanctified by the blood of a revolution, have been bequeathed to us and by our sires of '76—do adopt and publish the following:

Resolved, That we entertain a deadly and uncompromising hostility to all secret institutions for political purposes, and more especially to the so-called "Know-Nothing Order" as anti-republican and proscriptive in its tendency, and because its organization and mode of proceeding, its aims and objects, its form and spirit, are subversive of those great principles of civil and religious liberty, which have ever been, and, we trust, will ever continue to be, the pride and boast of the American people.

Resolved, That we consider it the duty of every lover of the Constitution and the Union; of every citizen who regards the peace, the order and dignity of society; of every Christian, who advocates the liberty of conscience; of every man, who is determined to maintain the rights of the South under the Constitution, to join with us in overthrowing the "black flag" of this mischievous and dangerous party, which unites Southern men in fillial (*sic*) party bonds with the worst elements of Northern fanaticism and constrains them to yield countenance to the dangerous and disgraceful movement of Abolitionism—that we earnestly urge our brother Democrats, who have been seduced into this miserable order, to retrace their steps, and to withdraw from an association, which, if it triumphs at all, must triumph upon the ruins of that time-honored party, with whom they have stood shoulder to shoulder in so many well fought political battles—that we will again extend to them and to all others who wish to join us, the right hand of fellowship, without requiring of them a fee for initiation or an oath of fealty, but simply an advocacy of our principles, with the privilege of leaving us at their own discretion.

Resolved, That we have an unlimited confidence in the patriotism,

integrity and capacity of the Hon. Thos. J. Rusk, and that he is our choice for reëlection to the trust that he has so ably and faithfully discharged.

Resolved, That the Hon. Sam Houston, in his affiliation with the "Know-Nothing Order," and in his open advocacy of their principles in opposition to the Democratic party, has forfeited our confidence in his patriotism and integrity—that his vote in the United States Senate, in opposition to the Nebraska-Kansas Bill, and his defence of the poor Indian, was a total and flagrant misrepresentation of the interests of the South and the wishes and views of the people of Texas; and that in the opinion of this meeting, the next Legislature ought to instruct him to resign the trust he has so wantonly violated.

Resolved, That the apparent ascendency of the "Know-Nothing party" in this county, as evidenced in the returns of the last elections, was owing to want of organization on the part of the Democracy, and a thorough and complete secret organization of the opposition—that the Democratic party of this county are now thoroughly organized, "wide awake" and duly "sober"—that they will continue this organization and in future act in concert with the Democracy, throughout the State; . . .

A meeting at the town of La Grange October 27 organized a Democratic association for Fayette County; it appointed delegates to the State Convention; it drew up resolutions rejoicing at the recent victories of the Democratic party in the United States at large; it pledged life, fortune and honor to the maintenance of the Constitution of the United States, which guarantees civil and religious liberties; and it condemned Know-Nothingism as anti-American, anti-Republican, and anti-Democratic:[80]

1st. Resolved, That amid the wild fanaticism which in times past has shaken, and to this day threatens to shake this nation to its centre, we hail with pleasure the late victories of the Democratic party in Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama, Texas, Maine, Pennsylvania and Indiana.

2nd. Resolved, That the true bond of the perpetual union of the States is the federal constitution, so constructed as to restrain the general government within the legitimate sphere of its granted powers and to secure to the states and the people all other powers not granted, and so administered as to cultivate and preserve fraternal sentiments and

[80] *State Gazette*, Nov. 10, 1855.

relations between the different members of the Confederacy and to give strength and durability to such a Union, the Democracy of Fayette County stands always ready to pledge "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor."

4th. Resolved, That among the great principles which animated the hearts and energized the arms of our revolutionary fathers, we recognize as prominent those which look to the obtainment for every citizen, of the rights of voting and being voted for without restraint or dictation, and of worshiping God without interference or hindrance; that we attribute no small share of the present power, glory and prosperity to the incorporation of these principles into our Constitution; and as we are satisfied that they are as valuable and as essential now as when our fathers poured out their blood to secure them, we should prove ourselves unworthy the rich inheritance bequeathed to us, if we failed to resist, with all our hearts and souls, every effort, whether by open assault or by secret combination, to expunge from the Constitution these great principles of civil and religious liberties.

5th. Resolved, That in the same manner and to the same extent that a secret and insidious foe is more dangerous than an open and manly opponent, we regard the attempt now being made to create, by secret oath-bound associations a law of public sentiment higher than the Constitution guarantees, in behalf of the enjoyment, by all citizens, whether native or adopted, of the rights of civil liberty and religious toleration, as more dangerous and more vigilantly to be resisted, than an open and direct attempt to render these guarantees nugatory and of no effect.

6th. Resolved, That a secret political organization which secures the fidelity of its members to its edicts, laws and regulations, by oaths of perpetual alliance, and which proposes to accomplish its objects by proscribing from civil offices one class of citizens on account of their religious creed and still a larger because they refuse to swear allegiance to its rules, and which seeks by means of cohesive power of office to obtain the control of the Government, both State and National for the avowed purpose of effecting objects inconsistent with the Constitution, is necessarily anti-American, anti-republican, anti-Whig, anti-democratic, destructive of political morality and calls for the united and ceaseless exertions of all truly conservative and national men for its overthrow.

7th. Resolved, That the scenes of violence, disorder and immorality which have marked the footsteps of the Know-Nothing organization

from its origin, to the late disgraceful and bloody tragedy enacted in a Southern State, ought to impress every lover of good order, of sound morality, and of pure Christianity, with the dangers of giving countenance and encouragement to an organization which has been seized upon by disunionists and abolitionists and made subservient to their unpatriotic and treasonable purposes, and which is shown by said experience, to be constantly perverted by bad men to the destruction of law, morality and religion.

Harris County, in a meeting at the Courthouse in Houston, October 20, organized a Democratic Association; appointed delegates to the Democratic State Convention; embodied in a set of resolutions the principal guarantees of civil liberty contained in the National and the State Constitution; voiced its opposition to the principles of the Know-Nothing party; and maintained that Democracy as well as Know-Nothingism was opposed to the immigration of paupers and criminals:[81]

Resolved, That the liberal principles embodied in the Constitution of our country, that, "All freemen, when they form a social compact, have equal rights, and no man or set of men are entitled to exclusive, separate public emolument or privileges but in consideration of public services," and that "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States," as well as also the provision in our State Constitution that "All men have the natural and independent right to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience," have ever been the cardinal principles of the American people, and that every attempt to abridge the rights therein secured, should be resisted by every true friend of his country.

Resolved, That believing the principles of the Know-Nothing party to be in opposition to the constitution and laws of our country, as well as unjust, illiberal, proscriptive, anti-republican and anti-American in their nature, we do hereby express our determined and uncompromising opposition to the same, as well as other secret political societies.

Resolved, That the Democracy, both native-born and adopted citizens are as much opposed to the emigration of all foreign paupers and criminals as the Know-Nothing party can possibly be, and that we deem it perfectly competent for the American people to protect themselves in this particular without the interference of any secret oath-bound party whatever.

[81] *State Gazette*, Nov. 5, 1855.

The fact that the Know-Nothings controlled the municipal elections held in Austin in the fall of 1855 and carried the mayoralty as well as several minor offices aroused suspicion in the minds of the Democrats that frauds had been committed at the polls. Consequently, the young men of the latter party organized an association to make an investigation into the recent elections and to militate for honest voting.[82] Preliminary steps for the formation of this organization were taken at a meeting held at Austin, November 15. Here a set of resolutions was drawn up which incorporated the political creed and principles of the organization. A committee was appointed to address the young men of Texas and to urge them to organize a like society in every county of the State for the purpose of securing the permanent ascendancy of the National Democratic party:[83]

Resolved, That we believe in, and will adhere to, against all opposition from whatever source, under whatever name or creed, the principles of the Democratic party, as publicly announced and uniformly sustained by that party from its foundation throughout the administration of Thomas Jefferson and each of the succeeding Democratic administrations down to the present time; and that we will still abide by, and sustain these principles as handed down by our fathers, unchanged by time, and uncorrupted by fusions or affiliations with federalism or any of the various creeds of fanaticism.

Resolved, That a Committee be appointed by the chair, whose duty it shall be to prepare a suitable address in behalf of the association to the young men of Texas, earnestly entreating them to rally under the old Democratic flag, and in order to secure the triumph of Democratic principles, to organize in every county in the State a "Young Men's Democratic Association.

A second meeting, held at the capitol November 18, adopted a platform of principles[83a] which included the following:

Resolved, That all men have a natural right, antecedent to the formation of civil society, and beyond the control of government, to religious freedom, the surrender of which is not necessary to the temporal welfare of the States, and cannot be relinquished even by the consent of

[82] *State Gazette*, Dec. 15, 1855.
[83] *State Gazette*, Nov. 17, 1855.
[83a] *State Gazette*, Dec. 22, 1855.

the citizen in a free government; that much less can any mere party or faction regulate that right by any party compact against his consent, without violating the cardinal principle and the spirit of our constitution, our laws and our free government; and that the civil rights, privileges or capacities of any citizen, should in no wise be diminished or enlarged on account of his religion.

Resolved, That we do not recognize any distinction among the citizens of the United States based upon the aristocratic principles of birth, and we hold that it is dishonest to repudiate the contract given by the Government, conferring all the rights of American citizenship in the letters of naturalization, and afterwards by a party compact, to debar naturalized citizens from the full benefit, while we leave them to the full burthens of the agreement.

Resolved, That the open discussion of public affairs is the foundation of the intelligence of the people and the safeguard of freedom,—that any secret association or brotherhood for political objects is dangerous to free institutions, destructive of social confidence, and contrary to the frank and manly character of a true American.

Other county meetings were held in the fall of 1855. Most of them in addition to organizing Democratic associations and appointing delegates to the State Convention drew up resolutions condemning Houston for his affiliation with Know-Nothingism and his negative vote on the Kansas-Nebraska bill and advocated sending petitions to the State Legislature to ask him to resign his seat in the United States Senate:

Hays County: Resolved, That the many past services of our senator, Sam Houston, add to his present shame and infamy for his base and traitorous desertion of Democracy and the just cause of the South, in this hour of peril, from a vain hope of reward from our enemy; and that by persisting in the grossest misrepresentations of both the will and interest of the people of Texas, has forfeited all claims to his title of honor, and to the confidence of his constituents.[84]

Walker County: Resolved, That Gen. Sam Houston, by his recent abandonment of the Democratic party, and joining the Know-Nothing conspirators, has forfeited all claims to Democratic support or sympathy, and that we believe it to be the bounden duty of the Legislature to pass resolutions instructing him to vacate his seat in the Senate of

[84] *State Gazette*, Nov. 17, 1855.

the United States. That the integrity of the Democratic party, the interests of the South generally, and of Texas particularly, and a proper sense of self-respect demands this action at our hands.[85]

Gonzales County: Resolved, That we disapprove of the course of Gen. Sam Houston in the United States Senate, upon the Nebraska and Kansas Bill, and for his affiliation with the Know-Nothing party and anti-Nebraska parties; and we do hereby declare that the interest of the slave State of Texas is not safe at this crisis in his hands.[86]

In addition to county resolutions the Democratic press advocated Houston's resignation as United States Senator:

If seats in the United States Senate were conferred as the expression of personal feeling and respect, regardless of other considerations we would not utter a word of objection to General Houston. But they are conferred for different considerations. . . . General Houston opposes and vilifies the administration for approving the Nebraska Bill, which enunciates the only principle upon which the South can rely for safety. He says that the passage of that bill was the great motive power which has enabled the Know-Nothings of the North to send a majority of abolitionists and free-soilers to the House of Representatives for the avowed object of repealing that bill; he joined that same Know-Nothing party, planted it in Texas for the purpose of arraying it against the administration. . . .[86a]

Another editorial stated:

We cannot uphold Senator Houston and condemn his conduct. If the emergency demands reliable Southern men, Texas ought to have it in her power to decide upon their qualifications as she has already decided upon their conduct. It is the right therefore of the Democracy to request the Legislature to ask and to give expression to that public opinion which, in the recent canvass, has been so elaborately, and so emphatically decided at the polls.[87]

The State legislature reflected the general attitude towards Houston. By a vote of 73 to 3 it condemned his vote on the Kansas-Nebraska bill.[88] However, notwithstanding this general con-

[85] *State Gazette*, Oct. 20, 1855.
[86] *State Gazette*, Nov. 17, 1855.
[86a] Editorial in *State Gazette*, Oct. 27, 1855.
[87] *Ibid.*, Oct. 27, 1855.
[88] *State Gazette*, Dec. 1, 1855.

demnation, Houston, while at Austin, was invited to a seat in the Senate. A similar proposition was made in the House, and this gave rise to a heated discussion.[89] Parker, of Tarrant, who introduced the resolution, said that it had no other purpose than to extend the courtesies of the House to a man who twice filled the Presidential chair of the late Republic of Texas, and who filled it with "honor to himself and glory to his country."[90]

The statements[91] made by Mr. Brown are typical of those made by the various Democratic members:

Mr. Speaker, under ordinary circumstances, I should be content to give a silent vote in favor of this resolution—not, sir, as a political vote; but as an act of courtesy, justified by all precedents, to a distinguished public man—to one who has been twice president of Texas, and is now her Senator. But, sir, under the present circumstances, and the feeling here present, I will state, that while I cheerfully vote for this mark of respect to Gen. Houston, I do not intend, and I wish it distinctly understood that I do not indorse his vote against the Nebraska Bill, nor his present political position. Political opposition shall never lead me to deny to distinguished public servants courtesies founded in liberality, and justified by past relations and long public service. With that understanding, I vote most cheerfully Aye.

The resolution was adopted by a vote of 48 to 32.[92]

Despite the fact that the Legislature[93] almost unanimously condemned Houston's vote on the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, there was a steady struggle for the assertion of Know-Nothing principles within that assembly. We have an outstanding evidence of this in the following joint resolution:

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Texas, That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives be requested—

1st. To use all honorable means to extend the time for the naturalization of foreigners to twenty-one years.

[89] *Texas Republican*, Dec. 15, 1855.

[90] Debates in the 6th Legislature (1855-56), 45-48.

[91] Debates in the 6th Legislature, 45-48.

[92] *Ibid.*

[93] After the State elections of 1855 there were 11 Know-Nothing, and 22 Democratic Senators; and 30 Know-Nothing and 60 Democratic Representatives.—*Texas Republican*, Dec. 15, 1855.

2nd. That they use their best exertions to procure a modification of the laws relating to emigration, so as not to permit the landing on our shores of any emigrant unless said emigrant bears with him or them the certificate of our consul abroad, as to their good character.

3rd. That they use their best endeavors to prevent the passage of any law by Congress, making grants of land to unnaturalized foreigners.

4th. That they oppose the organization of any territorial government, which allows unnaturalized foreigners to vote.[94]

The resolution was referred to the committee on state affairs. The latter in its report stated its objections to each of the four points, suggested substitutes[95] and recommended their adoption:

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Texas, That there exists no necessity for an extension of the time of residence in this country now required of foreigners, to enable them to become naturalized American citizens, and that the long established policy of the country in the naturalization of foreigners, is a purely American one, has eminently conduced to its present prosperity—made it the land of liberty and the asylum for the oppressed of every land, and is in accordance with the liberal principles of the Declaration of Independence. That it belongs exclusively to each State to bestow the right of suffrage within its limits, and to regulate the ingress and egress of foreigners thereto and therefrom, and the exercise of these powers by the Federal Government, would be unconstitutional, and full of peril to the States.

That every attempt by the Federal Government to abridge the right of aliens to become citizens, or to throw obstacles in the way of their immigration, or to prevent them from becoming owners of the soil when here, ought to be resisted with the same spirit which swept the alien laws from our statute books.

That whenever a district with sufficient population shall request the Federal Government to erect it into a Territory, it is the duty of Congress to comply with its wish, and it is improper to take from the Territorial Government, the power to regulate suffrage within it.

Campaign, 1856

The beginning of the year 1856 found Texas keenly interested in national as well as state issues. The Democrats of the State were bitterly disappointed at the election of Banks, one of the

[94] Report of the Senate Committee.
[95] Report of the Senate Committee.

"vilest abolitionists in the Union," to the speakership of the House of Representatives.[96] Both parties were closely observing the struggle between the pro- and anti-slavery forces in Kansas. These external events added to the intra-state issue of Know-Nothingism stimulated popular interest in the Democratic State convention of 1856.

This convention was held at Austin, January 16, 17 and 18. At first only 54 counties were represented; but by adopting a resolution which permitted members of the legislature from the unrepresented counties to act as delegates, the number of counties represented was increased to 91, leaving only 8 without representation. At this meeting delegates to the National Democratic Convention[97] State Presidential electors,[98] and nominees for State offices were chosen, and a State Central Democratic Committee organized.[99] The nominees for state officers were:

Attorney-General.....James Willie, of Washington
Comptroller.....James B. Shaw, of Travis
Treasurer.....James H. Raymond, of Travis

[96] *Texas Republican*, Feb. 16, 1856.

[97] Eastern Congressional district:

Matt Ward, of Cass; Richard B. Hubbard, of Smith; W. C. Pollock, of Nacogdoches; Sumter, R. G. Mills, of Lamar.

Western Congressional district:

W. S. Oldham, of Travis; W. P. Bee, of Webb; Jacob Waelder, of Bexar; Guy M. Bryan, of Brazoria.

[98] Presidential electors:

State at large: Frank W. Bowden, of Rusk; William R. Scurry, of Victoria.

Eastern Congressional district: A. J. Hood, of Cherokee.

Western Congressional district: A. J. Hamilton, of Travis.

[99] State Central Democratic Committee: John Marshall, of Travis, chairman; George W. Paschal, of Travis; Adolphus G. Weir, of Travis; T. Scott Anderson, of Travis; P. DeCordova, of Travis; Seaborn G. Sneed, of Travis; George W. Chilton, of Smith; Alfred E. Pace, of Fannin; S. H. Morgan, of Red River; John J. Goode, of Dallas; Thomas Rock, of Tyler; Stephen Powers, of Cameron; Oscar Farish, of Galveston; James C. Wilson, of Bexar; J. P. Henderson, of San Augustine; Thomas S. Lubbock, of Harris; H. L. Grinstead, of Cass; J. H. Speight, of McLennan; E. H. Cushing, of Brazoria; Albert N. Mills, of Gonzales; William Woodward, of Washington; J. T. Harcourt, of Fayette; Walter A. Andross, of Comal; A. P. Wiley, of Walker, and J. J. Linn, of Victoria.

The platform adopted reaffirmed the principles of the Democratic party as embodied in the Baltimore platform of 1852; it endorsed the Kansas-Nebraska act; it maintained that the abolitionists of Kansas, supported and encouraged by Northern abolitionists, were endeavoring to control the government of the territory and that such a course was at war with the principles of the Constitution and subversive of free government; and it voiced its opposition to secret political societies and to all proscription on account of place of birth or particular religious creed:[100]

(Resolved,) 2. That the Democracy of Texas are opposed to all secret political societies, whether called "Americans," "Know-Nothings," or any other delusive name; that all experience has shown that political combinations, the members whereof are bound together by oaths, covenants, or pledges are opposed to that freedom of action which is the essence of political liberty; and that public and unrestricted discussion of all matters of public concern is essential to the perpetuity of our free institutions.

(Resolved,) 3. That the Democracy of Texas are opposed to all proscription on account of place of birth or particular religious creed; that the guarantees, contained in our State or Federal Constitutions, of freedom of religious faith and worship, are one of the chief corner-stones of our republican edifice; and a principal support of our National liberty and prosperity; that any attempt to deny the right of our adopted citizens to a participation in the affairs of the government to the extent conferred in the Constitution of the United States, is anti-republican, opposed to the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and should be resisted by all who are devoted to the principles of justice and equality which characterize that Constitution, and which have made our country the asylum for the oppressed of every land, the persecuted of every faith, and the home of civil and religious liberty.

(Resolved,) 4. The Democracy of the State of Texas regard the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act as a triumph of the Constitution over fanaticism and sectional madness, and would regard its repeal as a violation of the spirit of the Constitution, and an outrage upon the rights of the Southern States of the Union; they insist upon the Old Democratic doctrines of States' rights, and a strict construction of the Constitution, as cardinal principles of the Democratic faith; that the principle of non-intervention by the Federal government is a doctrine of the Constitution, alike applicable to States and Territories; and any

[100] *State Gazette*, January 26, 1856.

attempt on the part of Congress to prohibit slavery in any territory that may hereafter be organized, or to restore the Missouri Compromise, or to repeal the Fugitive Slave Law, or to refuse to admit any new state that may hereafter apply for admission into the Union on account of slavery being recognized in its constitution, or to impose any restriction on the subject of slavery on any new state so applying, not imposed on the original thirteen states, or to impose any restriction upon the trade and intercourse between the slave States, or to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, would be a violation of this principle, and should be regarded as an attempt to trample on the Constitution and dissolve the Union, and should be resisted at every hazard, and to the last extremity.

Since the Know-Nothings in Texas had attacked the administration of Pierce, the Convention further resolved:

That the Democracy of the State of Texas indorse and approve the principles of the administration of Franklin Pierce, as evidenced by his inaugural address, his annual and special messages, and carried into practical effect by the leading measures of his administration.

And as there were in the convention some ex-Know-Nothings who were aspirants for office, and who were considered unreliable, to exclude such men from office, it was resolved:

That the convention will support no person as a nominee for any office or place of trust, unless fully satisfied by his acts and declarations, or the assurance of his friends in this convention that he is fully united with the Democratic party upon all the issues now existing between it and its opponents, and that such nominee will abide the decisions of this convention and support all of its nominees with zeal and fervency.

The suggested resolution to censure Houston for his vote on the Kansas-Nebraska bill was rather severe and gave rise to an animated debate. The substitute proposed by W. S. Oldham, being more moderate in tone, was unanimously adopted:

(Resolved,) That this convention do most fully and cordially endorse and approve the votes of Thos. J. Rusk, Geo. W. Smyth and P. H. Bell upon the Kansas-Nebraska Act, and that we do further most decidedly disapprove of the vote of Sam Houston upon the act, as not in accordance with the sentiments of the Democracy of Texas.

Three days after the close of the Democratic convention the Know-Nothing State convention [101] assembled at Austin in the Hall of Representatives. Only 53 counties were represented; but by a vote of the assembly Know-Nothings present—though not delegates—were allowed to act as such for their respective counties. At this meeting, delegates to the Know-Nothing National Convention,[102] presidential electors,[103] and nominees for State offices were chosen. Nominees for State officers were:

Attorney-General.....William Stedman, of Houston
Comptroller.....C. Robertson, of Bell
Treasurer.....William H. Tarlton, of Harrison

The platform [104] adopted declared in favor of native Americans

[101] This was the first convention, open to the public, held by the Know-Nothing party in Texas.

[102] Delegates to the National convention were: S. W. Sims, of Bastrop; J. H. Waddell, of Galveston; Ben Epperson, of Red River; M. D. Whaley, of Leon; T. A. Harrison, of Harrison; E. R. Peck, Travis, alternates: A. J. Fowler, of Anderson; G. McCoy, of Harrison; S. H. Darden, of Gonzales; R. Q. Mills, of Navarro; J. M. McCall, of McLennan.

[103] Presidential Electors—State at large:
John A. Wilcox, of Bexar
Robert H. Taylor, of Fannin
Eastern Congressional District—
J. W. Flanagan, of Rusk
Western Congressional District—
Thomas W. Blake, of Leon
Assistant Electors for the State at large:
J. F. Waddell, of Galveston; E. R. Peck, of Travis; B. H. Epperson, of Red River; D. Y. Portis, of Austin; W. P. Rogers, of Washington
Assistant Sub-Electors:
Fauntleroy, of Goliad; A. H. Davidson, of Bexar; L. F. Price, of Fayette; John Wheeler, of Fannin; Thomas Lewellyn, of Collin; George Wright, of Lamar; Hardin Hunt, of Hunt; F. E. Williams, of Cherokee; H. P. C. Hulaney, of Panola; B. L. Goodman, of Smith; W. H. Johnson, of Titus; G. McCoy, of Harrison; J. Marshall, of Harrison; D. McCoy, of Cass; B. F. Fly, of Gonzales; C. Cleveland, of Liberty; J. L. McCall, of McLennan.

[104] Committee on platform: W. E. Jones, of Comal; J. W. Flanagan, of Rusk; John Hancock, of Travis; John Sayles, of Washington; T. J. Chambers, of Liberty; Hugh McLeod, of Galveston; P. W. Kittrell, of Madison; John S. Ford, of Travis; W. A. Tarlton, of Harrison; J. A. Wilcox, of Bexar.

for office; expressed its devotion to the Constitution and the Union; advocated the extension of the probation period for naturalization to twenty-one years; upheld liberty of conscience and liberty of the press; protested against federal interference with slavery in the states and disapproved of the Kansas-Nebraska Act because it conferred the right of suffrage upon unnaturalized foreigners:[105]

The American party of the State of Texas, in convention assembled, declare as the cardinal principles of its organization:

1. The elevation to political office, executive, legislative, judicial, and diplomatic, of those only who are native Americans, or who being citizens of the Republic of Texas at the time of its annexation to the United States, made citizens thereof by the act of both governments.

2. The preservation and perpetuation of the Constitution and the Federal Union as the bulwark of our liberties in war, and a prime source of National greatness and individual happiness, and hence: first, opposition to all attempts to weaken or destroy it; second, opposition to the formation or encouragement of sectional or geographical parties—at this time the most threatening adversary to its stability.

3. A strict construction of the Constitution of the United States, and the preservation of all the rights of the States, secured or reserved in the Constitution; inculcating forbearance and a harmonizing spirit in settling apparent or real conflicts of jurisdiction; and repudiating the exercise of doubtful powers by the Federal government.

4. The extension of the period for the naturalization of foreigners to the term of twenty-one years, to be prospective in its operation, and the repeal by the legislatures of the States, in which they exist, of all laws conferring the right of suffrage on unnaturalized foreigners.

5. Liberty of conscience and liberty of the press. The right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience being secured by the Constitution and laws, any attempt to impair or abridge it would strike at the liberties of the people and should be resisted; but this inestimable privilege is never to be used as a pretext for violations of the Constitution or laws, or the practice of principles, creed, or system under the guise of religious belief, destructive of the principles of free republican government, or in conflict with the laws, and hence, opposition to all "higher law" doctrines which look to any power, foreign or domestic, civil, ecclesiastical or otherwise, for rule of civil or political action paramount to the Constitution and laws.

6. Congress possesses no power under the Constitution to legislate

[105] *State Times*, January 26, 1856.

upon slavery in the States where it does or may exist, or to refuse the admission of a new state into the Union because its constitution does or does not recognize slavery as part of its social system; nor to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the Territories of the United States; and any interference by Congress with slavery in the District of Columbia would be a violation of the spirit and intention of the compact by which the State of Maryland ceded the district to the United States, and a breach of the National faith; nor should Congress repeal the Fugitive Slave Law. And while we disapprove that principle of the Kansas-Nebraska Act which confers the right of suffrage upon unnaturalized foreigners and that which recognizes the right of the territorial legislature to establish or exclude slavery, we cordially approve the principle of nonintervention by Congress, and are opposed to the repeal of the act, and oppose any further agitation on the subject of slavery in the Halls of Congress.

7. The enactment of laws to prevent the transmission to our shores of felons and paupers from foreign countries.

9. We adhere to the National organization of the American party upon the basis of the platform of principles adopted at the Philadelphia convention in June, 1855, recommending the next National convention to modify the eighth article of said platform by striking out the words "Resistance to the aggressive policy and corrupting tendencies of the Roman Catholic Church in our country," for the reason that it has been so much misconstrued as to cast upon us the imputation of religious intolerance and a desire to abridge the liberty of conscience, which we utterly repudiate. But while we disclaim any intention to abridge or impair or interfere with the right of any citizen of whatever faith or denomination to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, we claim the right, indispensable to the security of free institutions, to resist and oppose, through the ballot box, every principle or policy, whether claimed or exercised as a right appertaining to any church government, or under pretext of any religious belief, hostile to liberty, or liberty of conscience, or liberty of the press, or liberty of suffrage, or to any other essential element of liberty, under the constitution and laws.

Apart from the clause proscribing Catholics, this platform as a whole was in general agreement with the national platform of 1855. The latter professed fealty to the Constitution and the Union; declared that Americans must rule America; advocated the extension of the probation period for naturalization to twenty-

one years; opposed the elevation to office of any person who acknowledged allegiance to any foreign prince, potentate or power; and, opposed interference with slavery in the States.[106]

An attempt was made by the Southern men to discard the religious test from the national platform. They did not succeed—it was affirmed and reaffirmed.[107] Moreover, the state platform in addition to abolishing the religious test, declared that all secrecy, obligations, and pass-words were abolished. However, by this time nearly every state had altered the secret system to suit its own taste and men were beginning to talk less of the "order" and more of the "party."

During this transitional period, while the organization was changing from a national secret society to a real political party, the anti-slavery sentiment was growing stronger. This slavery question led finally to a split in the party at the national convention held in Philadelphia, February 22, 1856. This split had left the Know-Nothing party ill prepared to take part in the national contest of 1856.

Although there were three parties in this race for the presidency of the United States, the question in Texas settled down to a choice between Buchanan and Fillmore:[108]

> The question of the chances of the three Presidential candidates, . . . is one of the very greatest importance to the southern people. The South has to make her choice between James Buchanan and Millard Fillmore. . . . The election of Frémont, we solemnly believe, will end in disaster and ruin to the Union, and we are not alone in this belief. Patriots, North and South, believe this, and have proclaimed it, time and again to the country. The South, then, must choose between the other two candidates However preferable may be the present position and past record of Mr. Buchanan, we will not disguise the fact that, if he has no chance of election, and the contest should be between Mr. Fillmore and Mr. Frémont, we conceive it to be the duty of every Southern patriot to support Mr. Fillmore. But, on the contrary, if Mr. Buchanan, who is by far the safest man for the South that is now before the people, should have the brightest chances of success, we unhesitatingly

[106] *State Gazette*, July 11, 1856.
[107] *State Gazette*, July 11, 1855.
[108] *The Standard*, Nov 1, 1856.

declare, and every patriot will approve, that it is the undeniable duty of the South, to a man, to support and vote for him.

Buchanan's nomination was well received. The Democratic press pronounced him "sound and true" on all the vital issues of the time. Ratification meetings were held in almost every county of the State.[109]

In Texas, as in the South in general, the Fillmore ticket was for a time almost completely ignored—it received no public party acclamations nor endorsements by the party's press.[110] However, the publication of his famous Albany Speech enkindled enthusiasm. It advocated the integrity of the Union and justice to the South, and protested against the existence of a sectional party:[111]

We see a political party presenting candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency, selected, for the first time, from the free states alone, with the avowed purpose of electing these candidates by the suffrages of one party of the Union only, to rule over the whole United States. Can it be possible that those who are engaged in such a measure can have seriously reflected upon the consequences which must inevitably follow, in case of success? Can they have the madness or the folly to believe that our Southern brethren would submit to be governed by such a chief Magistrate. Would he be required to follow the same rule prescribed by those who elected him in making his appointments? If a man living south of Mason and Dixon's line be not worthy to be President or Vice-President, would it be proper to select one from the same quarter as one of his Cabinet Council, or to represent the nation in a foreign country? Or, indeed, to collect the revenue, or administer the laws of the United States? If not, what new rule is the President to adopt in selecting men for office that the people themselves discard in selecting him? These are serious but practical questions; and, in order to appreciate them fully, it is only necessary to turn the tables upon ourselves. Suppose that the South, having the majority of the electoral votes, should declare that they would only have slaveholders for President and Vice-President, and should elect

[109] The *State Gazette* gives a brief account of those held in the counties of Travis, Rusk Fayette, Burleson, Calhoun, Williamson, Walker, Harrison, Gonzales and Grimes.—*State Gazette*, May 17; June 7; July 5, 12, 19, Aug. 9, 1856.

[110] *State Gazette*, March 29, 1856.

[111] Greely, I, 248.

such by their exclusive suffrage to rule over us at the North. Do you think we would submit to it? No, not for a moment, and do you believe that your Southern brethren are less sensitive on this subject than you are, or less jealous of their rights? . . .

Beginning with a meeting in San Antonio on March 31, ratification assemb lies were held in several counties of the State. These assemblies proclaimed Fillmore to be the only sound candidate and the standard-bearer of the only sound party on the subject of slavery. The resolutions [112] of the meeting held at Austin, April 26, may be cited as typical:

Resolved, That in Millard Fillmore, of New York, we recogize an enlightened patriot and statesman, of liberal and enlarged views, eminently conservative and national in character and feeling, whose past career furnished ample guarantees of his devotion to the Union, and that if elected to the office of President he will guard and protect the just rights of every section.

Resolved, That we repose the highest confidence in the integrity, ability and experience of Andrew J. Donelson, as a worthy pupil of that eminent patriot, Andrew Jackson, and as one in whose hands the destinies of this great country may safely be trusted in any contingency, a patriot without fear and above all reproach.

In this campaign the Democrats, in reviewing Fillmore's political antecedents, proved him not to be, as far as the South was concerned, a reliable candidate for the Presidency. As early as 1838, they found indisputable evidence of his anti-slavery sentiments in the "Erie Letter," which he wrote that year in answer to four inquiries [113] from the chairman of a committee of the Anti-Slavery Society of the County of Erie:

Do you believe that petitioning Congress on the subject of slavery and the slave trade ought to be received, read and respectfully considered by the representatives of the people?

Are you opposed to the annexation of Texas to the Union, under any circumstances, as long as slaves are held therein?

Are you in favor of Congress exercising all the constitutional power it possesses to abolish the internal slave trade between the States?

[112] *State Gazette*, May 10, 1856.

[113] *State Gazette*, March 22, 1856.

Are you in favor of immediate legislation for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia?

Reserving an exposition of his reasons for his opinions to some more convenient time, Fillmore returned a simple affirmative reply to these questions. In addition to hostility to slavery, the Democrats brought forward other charges against Fillmore: It was reported that in a speech which he delivered at Louisville, Kentucky, in 1854, he said that during the time Texas was preparing to take possession of that portion of New Mexico, which she considered as rightly hers, he ordered a portion of the army to the frontiers of Texas to prevent the accomplishment of her design.[114] His previous administration was condemned, and instances of mismanagement in foreign and domestic affairs cited as unmistakable evidences of his lack of abilty for so important an office.

An extract from a letter[115] written by Sam Houston to President Pierce at the close of Fillmore's Administration was quoted to show the unsound state of politics during the latter's term of office:

> Corruption infects the very atmosphere of the government; but few places are now sought by the tribes who hunt the spoils of office, without a view to some speculation or illicit gains; scarcely a contract is made with public functionaries without covering some fraud; and enormous claims are assisted (sic) and carried against the Government by infamous agencies, employing fraud and bribery as the means. I declare to you, Sir, that I have found, from some examinations I have been called upon to make, a disease at the heart of the Government, which, unless arrested, must eventually undermine the Constitution, and surrender the government to speculators.

On the other hand, the Know-Nothings endeavored to misrepresent Buchanan's attitude towards slavery and the annexation of Texas by publishing garbled versions of his speeches.[116] But the Democratic press defended him and showed that all the votes which he had cast in Congress were friendly to the South[117]; that he had been called upon to vote on every measure that had divided the

[114] *Texas Republican*, July 5, 1856.
[115] *Texas Republican*, July 5, 1856.
[116] *State Gazette*, July 26, 1856.
[117] *State Gazette*, Oct. 25, 1856.

national parties; and that "Upon the issues of a National Bank, Protective Tariff, Independent Treasury, Internal Improvement, Naturalization Laws, the Slavery question, the annexation of Texas, the Oregon question, the acquisition of Florida, the Mexican war, the terms of peace, our foreign policy and the acquisition of Cuba," he had been with the Democracy.[118]

In addition to the national ticket the campaign of 1856 embraced: (1) a state ticket; (2) county tickets; (3) a chief justice and two associate justices of the supreme court; (4) a district judge for the seventh judicial district; (5) a district judge and district attorney for each of the eighth, ninth, and fifteenth judicial districts; (6) a district attorney for each of the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, tenth, eleventh, and thirteenth judicial districts.[119]

The large number of press editorials and reports devoted to the national ticket and the comparatively insignificant space given to the other tickets during this campaign inclines one to believe that state-wide attention was almost entirely focused on the former. However, the exultation of the Democrats over the triumph of their party in local and state elections is an indication that exciting contests over these tickets had taken place.

As may be seen from the election returns in the following table, the campaign of 1856 was a decisive Democratic victory. The Democrats carried the national, the state, and, with few exceptions, the county tickets.

[118] *The Intelligencer* (Austin) Oct. 29, 1856.
[119] *State Gazette*, May 31, 1856.

ELECTION RETURNS FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES IN 1856

Counties	Electors for the State at large				Electors for Congressional District			
	Dem. F. W. Bowden	Dem. Wm. K. Scurry	K. N. Wm. E. Jones	K. N. R. H. Taylor	Dist. I Dem. A. J. Hood	Dist. II Dem. A. J. Hamilton	Dist. I K. N. J. W. Flannagan	Dist. II K. N. T. W. Blake
Anderson	612	612	325	325	612	612	325	325
*Angelina	114	114	77	77	114	114	77	77
Atascosa	87	87	58	58	87	87	58	58
Austin	358	358	120	120	358	358	..	..
Bandera	9	9	12	12	9	9	12	12
Bastrop	403	403	230	233	403	403	229	229
Bell	312	312	151	151	312	312	151	151
Bexar	747	747	318	318	747	747	318	318
Bosque	64	64	20	20	64	64	20	20
Brazoria	225	225	51	74	225	225	74	73
Brazos	56	56	74	74	16	16	74	74
Burleson	261	261	168	168	261	261	168	168
Burnett	141	141	76	76	141	141	76	76
Caldwell	395	395	196	195	395	395	196	196
*Calhoun	216	216	191	190	216	216	191	191
Cass	581	581	352	352	581	581	352	352
Cherokee	844	844	514	514	845	845	514	514
Collin	564	564	302	302	564	564	302	302
Colorado	252	252	133	133	253	253	133	133
Comal	284	284	26	26	263	284	16	26
Comanche	40	40	11	11	40	40	11	11

ELECTION RETURNS FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES IN 1856—Continued

Counties	Electors for the State at large				Electors for Congressional District			
	Dem. F. W. Bowden	Dem. Wm. K. Scurry	K. N. Wm. E. Jones	K. N. R. H. Taylor	Dist. I Dem. A. J. Hood	Dist. II Dem. A. J. Hamilton	Dist. I K. N. J. W. Flannagan	Dist. II K. N. T. W. Blake
*Cooke	97	97	39	39	97	97	39	39
Coryell	118	118	69	69	118	118	69	69
Dallas	603	603	245	245	603	603	245	245
Denton	308	308	132	132	308	308	132	132
De Witt	253	253	107	108	253	253	108	107
Ellis	239	239	176	176	239	239	176	176
*El Paso	1022	1022	..	..	1022	1022	..	..
Erath	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Falls	158	158	74	74	158	158	..	..
Fannin	577	577	229	238	577	577	229	229
Fayette	567	567	399	398	562	565	398	397
Fort Bend	196	196	136	136	172	172	136	136
Freestone	341	341	..	..	341	341	144	144
Galveston	431	431	314	314	431	431	314	314
Gillespie	115	115	25	25	115	115	25	25
Goliad	93	93	135	135	93	93	135	135
Gonzales	515	515	363	363	516	515	363	363
Grayson	415	415	182	182	415	415	182	169
Grimes	323	323	260	260	323	322	260	260
Guadalupe	359	359	258	255	359	359	255	255
Harris	645	645	449	449	645	645	448	449

Harrison	565	564	505	505	565	564	504	503
Hays	130	130	128	122	130	130	120	122
Henderson	292	292	75	68	292	291	77	74
Hidalgo	169	169	..	..	169	169	..	..
Hill	175	175	131	131	163	163	117	117
Hopkins	530	530	227	237	529	529	238	238
Houston	400	400	176	176	400	400	176	175
Hunt	392	392	138	138	392	392	138	138
Jackson	93	93	88	88	93	93	88	88
Jasper	185	185	..	99	185	185	99	99
Jefferson	109	108	49	49	108	109	49	49
Johnson	186	186	78	78	184	184	79	79
Karnes	103	103	119	119	102	103	119	119
Kaufman	191	191	63	63	191	191	63	63
*Kerr	16	15	9	9	15	15	9	9
Lamar	555	555	..	235	555	555	235	235
Lampasas	77	77	61	61	75	75	61	61
Lavaca	360	360	116	116	360	360	115	115
Leon	337	337	227	227	337	337	235	234
Liberty	180	180	103	103	180	180	103	103
Limestone	401	401	119	119	345	401	118	119
*Live Oak	19	19	16	16	19	19	16	16
Llano	55	55	23	23	55	55	23	23
McLennan	293	293	201	201	293	293	200	200

ELECTION RETURNS FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES IN 1856—Continued

Counties	Electors for the State at large				Electors for Congressional District			
	Dem. F. W. Bowden	Dem. Wm. K. Scurry	K. N. Wm. E. Jones	K. N. R. H. Taylor	Dist. I Dem. A. J. Hood	Dist. II Dem. A. J. Hamilton	Dist. I K. N. J. W. Flannagan	Dist. II K. N. T. W. Blake
Madison	113	113	125	125	113	113	124	125
Matagorda	111	111	43	43	111	111	43	43
Medina	136	136	39	39	136	136	39	39
Milam	211	211	196	196	211	211	196	196
Montgomery	179	179	163	163	179	179	163	163
Nacogdoches	557	557	182	182	554	554	182	182
Navarro	300	300	210	210	294	283	210	210
*Newton	138	138	79	88	137	137	89	88
*Nueces	128	128	..	..	128	128	..	..
Orange	73	73	60	60	73	73	60	60
Panola	458	458	130	130	458	458	135	130
*Parker	333	333	25	29	325	326	27	28
Polk	285	285	64	71	285	285	69	69
Red River	388	388	235	235	387	388	235	235
Refugio	82	82	37	37	82	83	35	35
Robertson	222	222	96	96	222	222	96	96
Rusk	1154	1157	669	669	1157	1157	668	669
Sabine	118	111	80	80	111	111	80	80
San Augustine	182	182	72	72	182	182	75	72
*San Patricio	49	49	..	..	49	49	..	..
San Saba	48	48	21	21	48	48	21	21

Shelby	308	309	76	77	309	309	77	77
Smith	810	810	370	370	810	810	370	370
Starr	347	347	17	17	372	372	17	16
Tarrant	490	490	92	92	490	490	92	92
Titus	502	502	257	257	501	501	257	257
Travis	551	551	467	466	549	548	463	465
Trinity	161	160	106	106	152	117	105	105
*Tyler	234	234	33	33	234	234	33	33
Upshur	683	683	255	255	683	683	255	255
Uvalde	18	18	22	22	18	18	14	22
Van Zandt.....	223	211	37	48	223	211	46	42
Victoria	141	141	117	117	142	141	117	117
Walker	387	387	343	343	387	387	343	343
Washington	653	654	481	481	651	636	481	481
Webb	382	382	..	..	382	382	..	..
Wise	67	67	..	11	67	67	..	..
Wharton	76	76	40	40	76	76	40	40
Williamson	307	307	240	240	307	307	240	240
*Woods	335	335	124	124	335	335	124	124
*Young	39	39	11	11	39	39	11	11
Cass (2nd returns).	38	38	8	8	38	38	8	8
Total	32,498	32,480	15,490	15,893	32,289	32,302	15,869	15,858

* Came in after date fixed for counting votes.

Ref.:Executive Register, E. M. Pease's Administration, P. 615-618. (State Library, Archives).

STATE TICKETS—ELECTION RETURNS, 1856

Counties	Comptroller		Treasurer		Attorney General	
	Democrat	Know-Nothing	Democrat	Know-Nothing	Democrat	Know-Nothing
	James B. Shaw	E. S. C. Robertson	James H. Raymond	W. A. Tarlton	James Willie	William Steadman
Anderson	599	353	576	362	506	424
Angelina	159	8	131	30	104	33
Atascosa	140	2	145	3	145	1
Austin	441	174	413	174	445	174
Bandera	8	11	8	11	8	11
Bastrop	497	285	512	270	489	273
Bell	297	250	373	164	388	138
Bexar	1280	445	1292	437	1281	442
Bosque	125	3	125	3	106	20
Bowie	153	2	129	2	118	2
Brazoria	359	22	341	22	360	19
Brazos	50	44	67	33	52	47
Burleson	329	62	320	69	321	76
Burnett	155	89	157	84	170	74
Caldwell	437	147	419	115	394	157
Calhoun	249	53	233	65	94	61
Cass	588	125	528	189	476	224
Cherokee	1064	481	1050	489	1001	414
Collin	343	79	331	77	308	97
Colorado	280	77	245	108	279	79
Comal	381	26	382	26	381	24
Cooke	242	9	245	5	235	14
Coryell	145	76	144	69	140	73
Dallas	732	10	729	10	707	20
Denton	243	21	248	23	250	34
De Witt	285	..	278	..	304	5
Ellis	252	52	248	55	239	57
El Paso	453	..	453	..	453	..
Falls	117	32	125	21	113	22
Fannin	501	121	503	124	564	123
Fayette	570	409	570	392	563	411
Fort Bend	219	74	229	64	202	84
Freestone	354	115	330	124	309	123
Galveston	512	145	486	159	474	177

STATE TICKETS—ELECTION RETURNS, 1856—Continued

Counties	Comptroller		Treasurer		Attorney General	
	Democrat	Know-Nothing	Democrat	Know-Nothing	Democrat	Know-Nothing
	James B. Shaw	E. S. C. Robertson	James H. Raymond	W. A. Tarlton	James Willie	William Steadman
Gillespie	257	3	254	1	256	1
Goliad	91	61	85	71	62	77
Gonzales	412	139	381	101	343	162
Grayson	254	105	233	111	218	108
Grimes	150	176	152	171	149	192
Guadalupe	424	249	415	239	415	230
Harris	580	214	558	207	559	219
Harrison	604	333	286	705	404	512
Hays	110	137	116	133	104	136
Henderson	284	22	267	30	247	32
Hill	183	25	189	18	187	14
Hopkins	364	77	347	104	314	125
Houston	489	120	489	110	447	154
Hunt	372	31	360	33	334	49
Jackson	57	39	36	3	89	40
Jasper	177	52	129	97	169	50
Jefferson	78	45	72	51	84	38
Johnson	192	28	137	28	182	30
Karnes	106	58	..	..	82	57
Kaufman	260	58	237	58	212	94
Kerr	37	..	38	..	37	..
Lamar	541	55	525	65	456	99
Lampasas	92	41	92	38	85	43
Lavaca	297	78	298	83	301	87
Leon	279	230	276	271	285	222
Liberty	159	142	132	167	140	154
Limestone	293	37	277	60	260	61
Llano	23	4	21	2	16	1
McLennan	361	138	355	143	372	118
Madison	42	103	36	106	35	107
Matagorda	153	..	..	..	152	..
Medina	166	9	166	7	124	7
Milam	264	222	267	97	310	98
Montgomery	84	209	94	221	83	212
Nacogdoches	633	138	491	268	346	419
Navarro	325	76	308	85	285	96
Newton	204	15	199	15	180	34

STATE TICKETS—ELECTION RETURNS, 1856—Continued

Counties	Comptroller		Treasurer		Attorney General	
	Democrat James B. Shaw	Know-Nothing E. S. C. Robertson	Democrat James H. Raymond	Know-Nothing W. A. Tarlton	Democrat James Willie	Know-Nothing William Steadman
Nueces	256	..	256	..	256	..
Orange	119	..	119	..	95	22
Panola	410	120	368	179	258	269
Parker	90	..	79	..	90	..
Polk	374	29	373	24	358	45
Red River	430	185	435	184	395	221
Refugio	129	8	127	8	128	8
Robertson	140	140	178	84	183	5
Rusk	1011	758	928	762	978	791
San Augustine	211	67	174	101	105	179
San Patricio	48	..	40	..	48	..
San Saba	34	18	34	16	43	17
Shelby	427	85	421	92	306	190
Smith	964	57	919	105	892	138
Starr	171	..	170	..	171	..
Tarrant	420	10	424	15	419	20
Travis	639	559	672	518	68	518
Trinity	215	63	195	82	189	82
Tyler	339	11	336	12	296	48
Upshur	562	85	497	130	441	137
Uvalde	11	14	11	15	9	16
Van Zandt	279	..	276	..	271	..
Victoria	208	87	194	90	188	107
Walker	347	275	346	273	346	277
Washington	867	292	833	315	674	365
Webb	197	..	151	..	190	..
Wise	51	..	51	..	38	..
Wharton	36	51	26	56	79	2
Williamson	323	247	311	263	264	286
Wood	348	18	349	20	314	46
Total	31,698	10,474	30,054	11,140	28,394	11,789

Reference: Records of the Executive Office (1853-1858), p. 534-540.

The more important municipal elections of this year were carried by the Democrats. In Galveston up to March, 1856, the Know-Nothings possessed exclusive control of the city, but in the elections of that month the Democrats regained the mayoralty and elected 17 out of the 21 municipal officers.[120] In San Antonio each party embraced in its ticket all offices down to and including constables. Here another Democratic victory occurred.[121]

In this city, during the campaign of 1856, a series of events took place, which threatened to end in mob violence. Differences among the Democrats at one of their meetings resulted in splitting the party. Both divisions made county nominations. The seceders influenced the Spanish paper, *El Bejareno,* to support their ticket; while the regular Democratic party, convinced that a large portion of the Mexican population was with them, started another Spanish paper, the *Ranchero.* Each of these papers did all it could to further the cause of its respective division; consequently, the campaign became very lively. The Know-Nothing Party was observing this contest very closely. Finally, an article appeared in the *Ranchero* in answer to an inquiry in the *El Bejareno* as to why the former was so interested in the success of the Democratic party. The *Ranchero's* answer appeared, in an incorrect translation, in the next number of the *San Antonio Herald* (Know-Nothing paper). The *State Gazette,* August 9, 1856, quoted the *San Antonio Herald* as stating:

> We appeal to the whole population of Bexar because we do not wish to see them joined to the Know-Nothing party; because this party wish to destroy them; because we know that with malice and hypocrisy they call them their friends now, to make them their slaves afterwards; because we firmly believe that they will be excluded from all participation in and intervention in public affairs; because we are convinced that in the same manner that heretofore, the Mexican population have been robbed of their property, so will they hereafter be deprived of all their rights and guarantees; because we do not hesitate to say that they (the Know-Nothings) would proclaim their victory with the roaring of guns and clashing of sabres, throwing down our churches and invading the sanctity of our hearths; and finally, because force would be their own

[120] *State Gazette,* March 15; Aug. 4, 9, 16, 13; Sept. 13, 1856.
[121] *State Gazette,* Jan. 3, 1857.

law, they would publish their decrees on the foreheads of the people and they would make themselves be obeyed at the crack of the whip and the discharge of the American revolver. . . .

This attack was greatly resented by the Know-Nothings. For several days after the article appeared, threats were heard on the streets. Some asserted that the editor of the *Ranchero* did not write the article, while others maintained that "the scoundrel who wrote it, if he was a foreigner, should be driven out of the country; if he was a native he should be hung." The excitement grew in intensity. The Know-Nothing party held a meeting and appointed a committee to inquire into the authorship of the article. Having found out that the editor was the author, they posted up handbills throughout the city calling a meeting of the party for the transaction of important business. But Mayor Devine, keenly alive to the situation, forestalled the commission of mob violence by causing a special police force of 150 citizens to be sworn in. This official act brought on him the hostility of the Know-Nothings, several of whom attacked his person, and in self-defense he shot John S. McDonald, a prominent Know-Nothing. That Democracy fully vindicated this action is evidenced by his reëlection to the mayoralty December 22, 1856.[122]

The State Campaign of 1857

Early in the spring of 1857, John Marshall, chairman of the State Central Committee of the Democratic party, issued a circular notifying the various counties that the annual state convention would convene at Waco the following May. During the interval between the serving of the notice and the holding of the convention county meetings were held to appoint delegates and suggest candidates for office.[123] In point of attendance this convention was the largest of its kind ever held in the State—95 counties were represented by 360 delegates.[124] To exclude all but Democrats from power the committee on platform, through their chairman, Ashbel Smith, made the following report:

[122] *State Gazette*, Aug. 9, 1856.
[123] *State Gazette*, June 13, 1857.
[124] *State Gazette*, May 30, 1857.

Your committee to which was referred sundry resolutions concerning pledges to be given by the candidates who shall come before this convention, to abide its decisions, and by members of the convention to support its nominees in the ensuing canvass, beg leave to report back to the convention the following resolutions and recommend their adoption; Resolved, That this convention will support no person as a nominee for any office or place of trust, unless fully satisfied by his acts and deliberations, or the assurance of his friends in this convention, that he is fully united with the Democratic party upon all the issues now existing between it and its opponents, and that such nominee will abide the decisions of this convention, and support all of its nominations with zeal and fervency.[125]

The following ticket was selected:

Governor ..... H. R. Runnels [126]
Lieutenant-Governor ..... F. R. Lubbock [127]

Commissioner of the General Land Office ..... F. M. White

On the adjournment of the State convention, the Congressional Convention for the Western District met at Waco [128] and nominated Guy M. Bryan,[129] while that of the Eastern, met at Tyler and nominated J. H. Reagan.[130] These nominations were ratified by the Democrats at large in county meetings, and they were given the unanimous support of the Democratic press.[131]

The campaign of 1856 disorganized the Know-Nothing party in the state to such a degree that it held no convention in 1857, and thus as a state organization it gradually ceased to exist. However, individual Know-Nothings were not ready to acknowledge the

[125] *State Gazette*, June 13, 1857.

[126] H. R. Runnels was elected lieutenant-governor in 1855, and previous to that time he was a member of the House of Representatives—A States' Rights man.

[127] F. R. Lubbock was a clerk in the Texas Congress in 1837, Comptroller in 1838—a thorough Democrat.

[128] Lubbock, 212.

[129] Guy M. Bryan had for ten years been a member of the legislature, first in the House of Representatives, and afterwards in the Senate. He was a nephew of S. F. Austin.

[130] Lubbock, 212.

[131] *State Gazette*, May 23, 1857.

futility of further effort, and in the campaign of 1857 they again supported a ticket, designated the independent ticket. The outstanding candidate on this ticket was Sam Houston. An extra of the *Huntsville Recorder* issued, May 12, 1857, announced his candidacy for governor:

> Today Gen. Sam Houston came to town and declared himself a candidate for governor. His enemies had declared if he ran, the issue would be "Houston and anti-Houston," and upon that issue he appealed to the people. He says he is not the candidate of a party, and if elected he intends to be Governor of the whole people—that he has been and ever will be a Jackson Democrat. His object will be to advance and promote the interests of the State, and people, as of old.[132]

In addition to Houston the independent ticket embraced:

Lieutenant-Governor.....Jesse Grimes
Commissioner of the General Land Office.....Stephen S. Crosby
Eastern Congressional District.....L. D. Evans
Western Congressional District.....Howth

This campaign was animated. Houston, starting his campaign tour in Galveston where he admitted that he voted for Fillmore although claiming to be a Buchanan man, visited many counties in Eastern and Western Texas in which he delivered speeches marked by bitter anti-Democratic hostility. East of the Trinity River, he was met and opposed by the best Democratic speakers in the State, L. H. Wigfall and W. R. Scurry; and west of that river, he had his opponent in the person of W. S. Oldham. While repelling the attacks of his opponents, he invariably vindicated his record in the United States Senate, and gained the sympathy of his audience by referring to the battle of San Jacinto.[133]

The Democratic speakers and press reviewed Houston's record in the United States Senate and severely condemned his vote of hostility to the South on all bills involving the slavery issue. It was shown that he voted for the Wilmot Proviso; that in 1848 he

[132] *Texas Republican*, May 23, 1857.

[133] *State Gazette*, May 30, 1857; Wooten, II, 46; Terrell, A. W. "Recollections of General Sam Houston," *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, Vol. XIV, 113.

voted and spoke in the National Democratic Convention in favor of abolitionists taking seats in that body; that he professed to be in favor of the Missouri Compromise but that, when it was proposed in 1848, to extend the line to the Pacific, he voted against it; that he voted against the Kansas-Nebraska bill because it repealed the Missouri Compromise and opened Kansas to slavery; and finally, that he vindicated in the Senate the petition of the 3000 New England abolition clergymen. He was further accused of blaming the frontier settlers for the Indian outrages on the frontiers of Texas; of preaching submission to Frémont during the presidential campaign of 1856; and of using the Baptist church to advance his political interests.[134]

J. H. Reagan, the Democratic candidate for the Eastern Congressional district, sent a program of his campaign tour with a request for a joint canvass to L. D. Evans, his competitor for the office. The petition was granted.[135] The series of joint debates lasted about nine weeks and in that time the candidates traversed 36 counties and engaged in 48 debates, each of which lasted not less than 5 hours. The following are Reagan's own statements embodying his objections to the existence of Know-Nothingism which he set forth in his discussions during this campaign tour:

> The first was that there ought to be no religious test in politics, that the framers of the Constitution of the United States and of the Constitution of our State carefully provided for the separation of church and state. While in principle I was a Protestant and was probably influenced by prejudice against the past history of the Catholic Church, I still regard the blending of politics and religion as dangerous to the future of our country.
>
> My second objection was that we ought not to make the place of birth of a citizen a political test. Foreign-born citizens, I urged, had aided in the struggle of our Revolutionary fathers to maintain the independence of this country; I argued that it had been the policy of the federal government and of the several state governments to invite intelligent foreigners from western Europe to help develop and build up our country and that it would be both inconsistent and wrong for

[134] *State Gazette*, June 20, July 1, July 4, 1857; *Texas Republican*, May 23, 1857.

[135] Reagan, *Memoirs*, 62-63.

us now to turn upon them and deny them the right either to vote under the conditions prescribed by law or to hold office.

My third objection was that secret political societies were un-American and unwise and endangered the future of our liberty and of our system of government, for ours was a government of the people and ought to be controlled by enlightened public opinion; and that free public discussion of political questions, I believe, was the only way in which we could expect to get a fair and just consideration of such questions, and further, I emphasized, that in secret societies such as the Know-Nothings, the most violent and radical men became the leaders and ruled the proceedings and dictated its conclusions, there being no chance for a presentation of opposing views and for the comparison of opinions. Upon these issues I was elected by between 3,000 and 4,000 majority.[136]

Lubbock also canvassed the entire state in the interests of the whole Democratic ticket; he visited 100 counties and delivered a speech every day except Sunday.[137] Both parties kept up with unabated zeal their electioneering until election day. And in spite of Houston's unsurpassed powers as an orator for a frontier audience as well as in spite of his past military and political life in Texas he was defeated. As is evidenced by the official returns, in the following table, the campaign was again a victory for the Democrats; their entire state ticket was elected.

[136] Reagan, *Memoirs*, 63-65.
[137] Lubbock, *Memoirs*, 221.

STATE TICKETS—ELECTION RETURNS, 1857

Counties	Governor		Lieutenant-Governor		Congress (District I)		Congress (District II)		Land Commissioner	
	Dem. H. R. Runnels	K. N. Sam Houston	Dem. F. R. Lubbock	K. N. Jesse Grimes	Dem. J. H. Reagan	K. N. L. D. Evans	Dem. G. M. Bryan	K. N. —— Howth	Dem. F. M. White	K. N. Stephen Crosby
Anderson	606	470	603	425	638	463	...	...	478	605
Angelina	71	170	65	166	78	154	...	...	56	185
Atascosa	186	95	178	59	...	...	225	13	186	62
Austin	424	273	438	259	...	...	456	231	366	336
Bandera	...	...	...	...	...	...	27	...	3	35
Bastrop	415	248	432	240	...	...	459	126	420	252
Bell	297	215	296	194	...	...	376	55	289	227
Bexar	927	521	950	469	...	...	1,178	34	900	536
Bosque	104	45	113	36	...	...	133	9	99	55
Bowie	262	54	240	67	235	70	...	...	217	339
Brazoria	349	58	384	26	...	...	394	6	287	123
Brazos	73	149	55	157	...	...	56	122	60	151
Brown	12	4	16	...	...	...	16	...	8	8
Burleson	290	338	292	315	...	...	324	178	271	339
Burnett	130	104	140	41	...	...	191	16	139	98
Caldwell	345	277	356	271	...	...	457	21	346	286
Calhoun	185	156	200	94	...	...	246	62	162	193
Cameron	670	76	681	71	...	...	751	...	519	137
Cass	587	369	580	356	547	353	...	...	527	365
Cherokee	925	824	939	765	964	748	...	...	906	832
Collin	469	360	482	293	554	257	...	...	397	400

STATE TICKETS—ELECTION RETURNS, 1857—Continued

Counties	Governor		Lieutenant-Governor		Congress (District I)		Congress (District II)		Land Commissioner	
	Dem. H. R. Runnels	K. N. Sam Houston	Dem. F. R. Lubbock	K. N. Jesse Grimes	Dem. J. H. Reagan	K. N. L. D. Evans	Dem. G. M. Bryan	K. N. —— Howth	Dem. F. M. White	K. N. Stephen Crosby
Colorado	316	167	321	152	...	...	409	27	219	269
Comal	313	37	318	33	...	...	324	5	310	46
Comanche	68	49	75	9	...	...	93	9	94	26
Cooke	126	100	131	70	132	85	...	...	117	107
Coryell	167	138	187	116	...	...	217	80	94	151
Dallas	569	404	589	318	649	282	...	...	501	486
Denton	230	192	233	137	264	155	...	...	228	206
DeWitt	244	178	302	24	...	...	369	14	198	217
Ellis	326	253	332	230	...	...	348	134	316	267
El Paso	898	14	804	...	...	...	805	...	81	734
Erath	29	33	41	9	...	...	64	...	30	37
Falls	113	214	114	214	...	...	154	76	110	205
Fannin	439	221	459	150	448	204	...	...	440	200
Ford Bend	212	126	221	105	...	...	253	52	104	221
Fayette	601	467	580	494	...	...	731	281	530	547
Freestone	336	225	342	226	...	...	382	51	329	244
Galveston	451	180	476	181	...	...	478	162	400	262
Gillespie	256	31	276	3	...	...	234	12	138	152
Goliad	126	152	150	126	...	...	206	24	114	169
Gonzales	479	390	491	342	...	...	523	105	479	397
Graystone	492	361	468	318	463	334	...	...	415	397
Grimes	287	354	283	355	...	...	365	214	288	334
Guadalupe	354	255	344	70	...	...	390	24	355	243

Harris	685	474	728	435	...	...	...	...	...	...
Harrison	601	556	601	563	598	558	...	...	593	576
Hays	86	129	85	130	...	...	107	62	92	124
Henderson	289	145	296	130	312	128	...	...	251	187
Hidalgo	210	3	220	...	...	...	...	...	130	87
Hill	120	171	118	168	...	...	145	101	111	177
Hopkins	600	348	593	251	620	278	...	...	577	345
Houston	422	313	445	275	462	251	...	...	424	303
Hunt	386	257	382	130	398	210	...	...	340	306
Jack	26	32	26	26	53	4	...	...	14	37
Jackson	74	115	86	92	...	...	95	57	126	56
Jasper	216	161	233	137	228	146	...	...	185	191
Jefferson	95	97	92	52	79	80	...	...	40	126
Johnson	149	203	171	90	...	...	228	54	139	188
Karnes	121	143	147	50	...	...	158	82	108	158
Kaufman	249	219	252	195	282	171	...	...	208	252
Kerr	33	20	36	12	...	...	46	...	22	25
Kinney	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Lamar	632	343	636	304	656	305	...	...	613	327
Lampasas	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Lavaca	336	216	368	116	...	...	465	24	278	281
Leon	365	355	345	377	...	...	415	234	253	360
Liberty	259	176	261	173	249	172	...	...	247	187
Limestone	352	193	350	195	...	...	365	96	348	193
Live Oak	68	64	67	36	...	...	89	19	68	66
Llano	70	23	62	7	...	...	63	...	74	14
McCullock	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...

STATE TICKETS—ELECTION RETURNS, 1857—Continued

Counties	Governor		Lieutenant-Governor		Congress (District I)		Congress (District II)		Land Commissioner	
	Dem. H. R. Runnels	K. N. Sam Houston	Dem. F. R. Lubbock	K. N. Jesse Grimes	Dem. J. H. Reagan	K. N. L. D. Evans	Dem. G. M. Bryan	K. N. —— Howth	Dem. F. M. White	K. N. Stephen Crosby
McLennan	260	291	269	282	...	...	346	150	261	282
Madison	73	157	65	160	...	...	79	96	67	163
Matagorda	148	12	146	7	...	...	174	...	47	133
Maverick	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Medina	125	46	131	23	...	...	159	1	130	44
Milam	213	256	213	257	...	...	229	141	198	262
Montgomery	161	290	170	277	...	...	204	142	173	274
Nacogdoches	441	592	454	597	490	521	...	...	424	622
Navarro	311	380	285	361	...	...	312	207	235	432
Newton	130	128	127	111	122	116	...	...	122	99
Nueces	247	120	265	96	...	...	357	...	139	215
Orange	55	116	72	70	66	88	...	...	46	125
Palo Pinto.....	47	34	60	10	...	...	69	...	51	31
Panola	469	243	462	215	465	248	...	...	443	247
Parker	139	387	229	184	...	...	268	44	244	249
Polk	361	110	364	102	351	96	...	...	345	118
Presidio	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Red River.....	398	327	410	305	409	301	...	...	403	319
Refugio	108	59	141	12	...	...	144	13	92	75
Robertson	162	199	150	191	...	...	160	76	147	199
Rusk	1,009	748	1,034	711	1,050	692	...	...	1,019	756

Sabine	66	199	63	180	60	200	...	...	32	225
San Augustine	162	194	172	180	186	170	...	...	158	200
San Patricio	36	15	35	2	...	...	40	4	29	23
San Saba	37	39	37	40	...	...	36	...	46	26
Shelby	203	378	219	357	235	347	...	...	212	365
Smith	828	558	830	544	867	519	...	...	730	638
Star	358	75	361	68	...	...	398	...	350	71
Tarrant	317	335	374	196	...	...	515	61	316	361
Titus	509	415	503	416	523	398	...	...	489	426
Travis	458	498	509	487	...	...	600	283	481	519
Trinity	234	170	214	150	232	172	...	...	209	184
Tyler	304	141	349	69	317	114	...	...	268	170
Upshur	593	345	600	347	604	363	...	...	575	389
Uvalde	25	32	24	9	...	...	30	...	24	32
Van Zandt	282	113	283	95	298	97	...	...	211	176
Victoria	190	108	187	106	...	...	194	71	188	110
Walker	356	390	373	377	...	...	379	10	378	376
Washington	643	548	687	488	...	...	732	294	667	526
Webb	344	8	353	...	...	...	353	...	209	140
Wise	59	137	74	89	105	77	...	...	21	166
Wharton	154	19	158	6	...	...	164	8	127	37
Williamson	289	293	301	194	...	...	425	32	281	294
Young	45	20	48	17	52	2	7	...	40	25
Total	32,552	23,628	33,379	20,318	15,341	9,929	20,321	4,505	28,394	26,171

Reference: Records of the Executive Office (1853-1858), pp. 115-118 and 647 — 649

The Cart War

On November 30, 1857, an Executive message informed the legislature of the assaults made upon a train of Mexican cartmen while on their way from San Antonio to the coast. The Governor added:

> It is painful to record such acts of violence, and a subject of deep mortification that the law places no means in my power to prevent them. Such outrages cannot occur and pass unpunished in a country where the officers and mass of the people entertain a proper respect for the laws; and it becomes a matter for your consideration, whether the citizens of a county that permit such acts to be done with impunity, should not be compelled to pay a heavy pecuniary penalty—this would, without doubt, arouse them to the necessity of preserving the public peace.
>
> It is now very evident that there is no security for the lives of citizens of Mexican origin engaged in the business of transportation, along the road from San Antonio to the Gulf unless they are escorted by a military force.
>
> The term of service of the militia now employed, will expire on the 8th day of December, and unless some direction is received from the Legislature, to continue their services, I shall feel it my duty to discharge them on that day. It will require an appropriation of about fourteen thousand five hundred dollars, to pay the services of the company and for their subsistence and forage.[139]

The Senate referred the message to the Committee on State affairs, and requested the Committee to which it should be referred in the House to act in conjunction with the senate committee in the consideration of the subject.[140] Mr. Stockdale from the joint committee of the two Houses recommended the passage of joint resolutions to pay the company of militia called into service by the Governor, and to authorize their continuance in service for a period specified in the resolution.[141] Furthermore, he stated that he represented a portion of the State in which the outrages were committed; that after the first crimes were perpetrated he attended

[139] *Senate Journal*, 7th Legislature, 82.
[140] *Ibid.*, 83.
[141] *Ibid.*, 145.

a meeting called by the law-abiding citizens of Goliad for the purpose of considering the most effective means of suppressing the lawless proceedings; that at the meeting many of the citizens of Goliad were earnestly desirous of vindicating the law and establishing order; but that many others, although they took no part in the conspiracy were indifferent as to its consequences. He attributed the attitude of the latter to preconceived prejudices against persons of Mexican origin. Moreover, he declared that the effect of the efforts of Goliad to suppress said lawlessness only changed the scene to the adjoining county of Karnes; that no train of carts was safe on the road without an armed escort; and that it was not until this state of things existed that the Executive took action.[142] Mr. Britton, who represented a western constituency, asserted that his people had reasonable grounds for believing that these outrages were but the germ of a movement to deprive the Mexican of his civil rights, which had been guaranteed to him by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and the Constitution and laws of the United States.[143] When the bill was being discussed in the House, Mr. McKenney, of Hopkins, remarked that he had listened patiently to the debate, to the questions asked and answered by honorable members in their places and that he was surprised to hear it said that the people and their officers of Goliad and Karnes counties would execute and carry out the laws of the county against those who had cruelly and wantonly murdered the Mexican cartman. He added:

> Facts speak louder than words. I have before me now the resolutions of a public meeting held in Goliad county, which were passed unanimously among which is the following: "that we declare the sentiments of this meeting, and we believe the sentiments of the whole people throughout this section, to be, that the continuance of the greasers or Peon Mexicans as citizens among us, as an intolerable nuisance, and a grievance which calls loudly for redress" With this public expression of the feelings of the citizens of Goliad county—held with murderous coolness, in the midst of the bloody scenes of the inhuman massacre of these same "greasers and Peon Mexicans"; with the well known fact that a combination exists in the counties of Karnes and Goliad to

[142] Debates in the 7th Legislature, 22-24.
[143] Debates in the 7th Legislature, 22-24.

murder peaceable, law-abiding, unoffending Mexican cartmen . . . with all these facts so notorious and so serious as to become the matter of special correspondence between the Mexican Government and the United States, and between the latter and our State government, we are gravely told that the existing laws of the land afford ample remedies for these disgraceful outrages, and that these same laws can be executed in these counties, and by the officers of the same! It is clear to my mind, and I think . . . to the mind of every member who will soberly think of it, that the life of anyone who applied for a warrant or the officer who attempted to execute the same in these counties, would be forfeited; these same citizens who have resolved that the longer continuance of the 'greasers' among them to be a nuisance, and their aiders and abettors who have declared a war of extermination against them, certainly will not spare those who attempt to arrest their purpose by punishing these assassins.[144]

Norton, from Henderson, arraigned Governor Pease before the House by asserting that he had been callous to the sufferings of the men, women and children on the frontier when they were being scalped by the Indians, and that, when a few Mexicans had been murdered, he acted promptly.

Mr. Brown refuted these charges by facts showing that the Governor had always done his duty towards the frontier. He then read an extract from the proceedings of a meeting held at Goliad, November 14, 1857. This meeting, he stated, was presided over by a Know-Nothing, had a Know-Nothing secretary, and moreover, three of the five members appointed to draw up resolutions expressing the sentiments of the meeting were Know-Nothings:

On the 3rd day of July last, a train of Mexican carts, on their way from Port Lavaca or Powder Horn to San Antonio, laden with corn and flour, were assaulted at Manahuila Creek in this county, by a party of men, said by the Mexicans to be white men, who cut the wheels of carts so that they broke and fell down. Numerous shots were fired by the attacking party, and these Mexicans were wounded. No robery (sic) was committed, and no other damage was done.

On the 14th day of July last, another train of Mexican carts, numbering some fifty or sixty, on their way from San Antonio to Powder Horn, empty, were assaulted at a late hour in the night, in the suburbs

[144] Debates in the Legislature of 1857, 44-45.

of this town, by a party of men said by the Mexicans to be white men, and to the number of some 15 or 20, who cut some of the spokes of the wheels of six carts, so that they were broken down. A great number of shots were fired by the attacking party, but no one was hurt; no robbery was committed, and no other damage was done.

On the 31st day of July last, another train of Mexican carts, numbering some 15 or 20, on their way from Powder Horn to San Antonio, laden with merchandise, were (sic) assaulted at the Cabeza Creek in the county, at a late hour in the night, by a party of men said to be white men, who fired upon the Mexicans and upon a white man named Edwards, who had the train in charge, wounding Edwards, severely and three Mexicans slightly. From the statement of Edwards it appears that the attacking party shot him deliberately, with an intention to kill him, and it is altogether probable that they knew he was a white man. . . .

Commenting on these items, Brown maintained that the whole affair had its origin in Know-Nothing principles and he considered it one of the last phases of that movement.[145] Notwithstanding the fact that the debates reveal a considerable amount of anti-Mexican hostility, the bill passed the Senate with only one, and the House with only thirteen dissenting votes.[146]

State Campaign of 1859

The elections of 1857 being over, the Know-Nothings seemingly ceased their activities. That they were still a factor in State politics, however, was demonstrated in the campaign of 1858, when, although they had no state ticket, they rallied to the support of, and placed in office [147] James H. Bell, the competitor of C. W. Buckley, the nominee of the Democratic State Convention for an associate justiceship of the supreme court of the State.

In the early months of 1858, and prior to this state campaign, the national Democratic party split over the question of the admission of Kansas under the Lecompton constitution. The Southern

[145] Debates, 7th Legislature, 85-88.

[146] *The Intellingencer* (Austin) Dec. 3, 1857.

[147] J. H. Bell received 25,325 votes
C. J. Buckley received 24,904 votes.
Record of the Executive office, R. H. Runnel's Administration, 181-185.

Know-Nothings, as their press evinced, were in high spirits over the situation, for it strengthened their hopes for an effective reorganization of their party. However, persuaded that a Know-Nothing party alone would be unable to secure a national victory, they initiated a movement to unite all those opposed to the admission of Kansas under the Lecompton constitution into one party. This party, then in the process of formation, they called the "opposition party."[148]

The exact time when this party was organized in Texas the present writer, even after a close investigation, is unable to state. However, a correspondent of the *State Gazette,* living in San Antonio, wrote in May, 1859, that a secret political organization was in existence in that city; that it was composed of distinguished members of the Know-Nothing party and disappointed aspirants of the Democratic party; that the society was to profess to sustain Buchanan's administration; but that it would oppose filibustering and the foreign slave trade.[149]

The Travis County unit of this party held a meeting at Austin, May 21, 1859. Prior to the meeting an invitation was extended to all who were in favor of the Union, the constitution, and the administration of Buchanan to attend. However, when John G. St. Clair suggested resolutions denouncing Know-Nothing principles, approving the administration of Buchanan, and favoring a thorough reorganization of the Democratic party, he was instantly cried down and given no opportunity of making remarks in favor of their adoption.[150]

Although the opposition party held no state convention, it supported an independent ticket for state officers. Again, Houston proclaimed his candidacy for the governorship of the State with a concise announcement of his platform in a letter addressed to George W. Paschal, the editor of the *Southern Intelligencer,* Austin:[151]

[148] *Texas Republican,* July 29, 1858, quoting the *Dollar Times* of Cincinnati.

[149] *State Gazette,* May 24, 1859.

[150] *State Gazette,* June 25, 1859.

[151] Winkler, 80.

Dear Sir: On yesterday I yielded my own inclinations to the wishes of my friends and concluded, if elected, to serve the people as the Executive of the State. The Constitution and the Union embrace the principles by which I will be governed if elected. They comprehend all the old Jacksonian National Democracy I ever professed or officially practised.

I am thine truly
Sam Houston.

The Independent, or Opposition State ticket was made up of:

Governor	Sam Houston
Lieutenant-Governor	Edward Clark [152]
Commissioner of the General Land Office	Stephen Crosby
First Congressional District	W. B. Ochiltree [153]
Second Congressional District	A. J. Hamilton [154]

The State Democratic Convention in 1859 met at Houston. It endorsed the Cincinnati platform; reaffirmed the Waco platform; declared the Dred Scott decision a true exposition of the Constitution; declared that territorial legislatures had no right to exclude slavery from the territories; and expressed a desire for the acquisition of Cuba.[155]

The Western Congressional district also held its meeting at Houston and nominated G. N. Waul,[156] of Gonzales. Whereas, the Eastern Congressional district met at Henderson and renominated John H. Reagan.[157]

The Democratic State ticket for 1859 was:

Governor	H. R. Runnels
Lieutenant-Governor	F. R. Lubbock
Commissioner of the General Land Office	F. M. White
First Congressional District	J. H. Reagan
Second Congressional District	T. N. Waul.

[152] Secretary of State in 1853 under Pease, a Know-Nothing in politics, and a lawyer of mediocre ability.

[153] The Whig candidate for Congress in 1851, and for governor of the State in 1853, a Know-Nothing in politics, a lawyer, and a good speaker.

[154] A. J. Hamilton had been an Attorney-General, a member of the legislature, a Democrat in politics, and a presidential elector on the Buchanan ticket.

[155] *State Gazette*, May 14, 1859.

[156] A distinguished lawyer, and a strong States'-Rights Democrat.

[157] Lubbock, 245.

This campaign was very exciting and acrimonious. Canvassers of both parties visited every county in the State. The opposition party vigorously assailed Governor Runnels' frontier policy, and accused the Democratic candidates of being disunionists and of advocating the reopening of the African slave trade. However, as to the latter allegation an explanation is necessary.

From 1858 on, owing to the scarcity of slave labor, the policy of reopening the African slave trade had been publicly discussed in certain sections of the South; while in Texas, an attempt had been made to test public opinion on that subject by reprinting from the newspapers of other states articles which advocated the movement. That the movement was favored in certain parts of Texas in 1859 is evidenced by the resolutions adopted at county conventions.[158]

That the subject threatened to become a campaign issue is further manifest by the circular published by Congressman J. H. Reagan in April, 1859. He had been informed that an effort was being made "'to interpolate on our platform of principles declarations in favor of filibustering and the reopening of the slave trade,'" and that an attempt would be made to defeat him in his candidacy for Congress because of his opposition to these two proposals. In reference to the reopening African slave trade he said that it was "'ridiculous to talk of doing it in the Union, unless it

[158] Gonzales County declared that laws making the slave trade a piracy were unconstitutional, and that the African slave trade as the source and necessary concomitant of slavery was morally right.—*State Gazette*, April 23, 1859.

The resolution adopted by the Fort Bend Convention declared all laws prohibiting the African slave trade a standing reproach and an offensive stigma upon the institution of slavery, which in the South was regarded as a great benefit both to the white, and negro race.—*State Gazette*, April 9, 1859.

Caldwell County Convention resolved that they deemed any law of Congress making the foreign slave trade piracy as a usurpation of power not warranted by the Constitution of the United States, and that it ought to be repealed.—*State Gazette*, April 9, 1859.

Lavaca County declared that Congress had no right to proclaim the importation of African slaves "Piracy", that the regulation of such traffic fell within the jurisdiction of the State.—*State Gazette*, April 23, 1859.

be ascertained that Congress has no authority to legislate on the subject.' " [159]

On the other hand, there were sections of the State that were strongly opposed to the reopening of the African slave trade. Indications of this opposition are again found in resolutions adopted at county conventions.[160]

Furthermore, at the Democratic State Convention at Houston, May, 1859, G. W. Chilton introduced a resolution " recommending a thorough canvassing of the constitutional rights of Congress in regard to slavery legislation." [161]

After a heated discussion the resolution was voted down by a vote of 228 to 81.[162]

However, despite the fact that the Houston Convention rejected the slave trade question, the opposition party persisted in making it a vital issue in the campaign. Consequently, the Democratic candidates were forced to declare their attitude toward it: In an open letter addressed to the editor of the *Galveston Union* containing answers to a series of questions relative to the slave trade, F. R. Lubbock wrote:

In answer to your first and second interrogatories, first, 'Are you in favor of or against the reopening of the African slave trade?' and second, 'Do you believe the law which declares the African slave trade piracy, constitutional?' I beg leave to state that, in accepting the

[159] Barker, " The African Slave Trade," *Texas State Historical Association*, Vol. VI, 157-158.

[160] The Democrats of Jackson County resolved that they deprecated under any circumstances the reopening of the African slave trade, and that they would " oppose any action having a tendency to it."—*State Gazette*, April 30, 1859.

Galveston County instructed its delegates to the State convention to vote against the adoption of all platforms which in any way would tend to the reopening of the African slave trade.—*State Gazette*, April 30, 1859.

The Democrats of Victoria County counselled their delegates to the State Convention to oppose the incorporation into the State platform of any new plank advocating the reopening of the slave trade, for the introduction of such would only tend to divide, distract, disorganize, and finally defeat the party.—*State Gazette*, April 30, 1859.

[161] Barker, " The African Slave Trade," *Texas State Historical Association*, Vol. VI, 158.

[162] Lubbock, *Memoirs*, 245.

nomination of the Houston convention, I determined to confine myself to the platform of principles enunciated by said convention. I approve of the action of said convention in refusing to discuss or make the reopening of the African slave trade an issue, and shall not discuss the constitutionality or policy of said measure. In answer to your third interrogatory, 'Do you believe that causes now exist which make a dissolution of the Union desirable?' I say 'No'. In answer to your fourth interrogatory, 'Do you believe that our courts ought strictly to enforce the slave trade piracy law?' I say that every law, until repealed or declared unconstitutional, should be enforced by the courts of the country.[163]

In an open letter to John Marshall, editor of the *State Gazette* and a thorough States' Right Democrat, Governor Runnels, a candidate for reëlection, endorsed the political opinions of Lubbock. He wrote:

I am now, as I have ever been, for the Union under the Constitution and the strict maintenance of the supremacy of the laws; and I do not consider that there is any cause for a dissolution of the Union at this time.[164]

In reply to a letter dated August 22, 1859, and signed by John M. Ward, Thomas Goree and three other men, John H. Reagan through the medium of a similar letter wrote:

I am opposed to the reopening of the African slave trade, to filibustering, to disunion per se, and the formation of a Southern Confederacy, on the one hand, I am, on the other, opposed to the idea of a slavish devotion to the Union under a violated Constitution.[165]

The Democrats while repelling the attacks made on their party and candidates declared that Houston had not abandoned his Know-Nothing principles. A passage from the circular[166] of A. D. Burress, an unwavering supporter of Houston, and a Know-Nothing candidate for the legislature from Harrison county, was cited in support of their statement:

The American party has been under a temporary cloud, and Houston,

[163] Lubbock, 247.
[164] Lubbock, 247.
[165] Lubbock's *Memoirs*, 245-246.
[166] *State Gazette*, July 30, 1859.

like a skilful tactician, has chosen not to run blindly against prejudice. You know he has insisted that Jackson Democracy and Americanism are identical—a sentiment which he has never retracted. *The Flag* has sagaciously contended that 'American' principles are growing in popular favor, and that decent, and well informed foreigners have become satisfied that the party is not proscriptive from the fact that it restricts them from voting until they have been in the country twenty-one years, and that it is not intolerant because it refuses to permit Catholics to hold office. As an evidence of this, several of the leading Democrats of the State, with a full knowledge of General Houston's position, are supporting him, and the Galveston Union, a very widely circulated and influential paper, is openly supporting him.

Furthermore, an extract from one of Houston's speeches delivered in the United States Senate, April 7, 1858, was published to falsify artful attempts that were being made to show that he had dropped his Know-Nothing doctrines:

> The Senator from Tennessee thinks that even a shorter period than now required, a very short period, would be long enough for them to be changed from subjects of a foreign government to citizens of this country. Now, Sir, I should like to know to what tribunal he would refer them for the adjudication of their qualifications as citizens; for thousands of them, even in my own state cannot speak the English language, and cannot read anything printed in English. How would he determine as to their qualifications? Would it not require a very tedious and laborious examination to ascertain whether they understand the Constitution of the United States, all the laws of the State of Texas, and all other things necessary to be understood, to be good citizens. Persons reared in the United States, who have but ordinary opportunities, generally have a general comprehension of these subjects, though they may not be familiar with all the details. I think five years short enough, and if the period were four times as long I do not think it would be too much.[167]

Houston himself made a thorough canvass of the State, in which he vindicated himself against the attacks made upon him by his opponents, condemned the reopening of the African slave trade and pleaded for the preservation of the Union. That his speeches had a telling effect upon his audiences may be seen in the election of the entire opposition ticket. The returns of this election are shown in the following table:

[167] *Congressional Globe*, 35th Congress, 1st session, 1513.

STATE TICKET—ELECTION RETURNS, 1859

Counties	Governor		Lieutenant-Governor		Congress (District I)		Congress (District II)		Land Commissioner	
	*Op. party Sam Houston	Dem. party H. R. Runnels	Op. party Edward Clark	Dem. party Francis Lubbock	Op. party W. B. Ochiltree	Dem. party J. H. Reagan	Op. party A. J. Hamilton	Dem. party T. N. Waul	Op. party Stephen Crosby	Dem. party F. M. White
Anderson	670	423	457	572	214	843	...	...	606	463
Angelina	315	107	310	70	50	301	...	...	284	47
Atascosa	148	77	182	78	...	...	172	90	162	91
Austin	405	507	334	565	...	...	355	533	110	776
Bandera	17	28	16	29	...	...	18	26	23	23
Bastrop	363	406	334	450	...	...	358	424	269	502
Bee	46	46	46	44	...	...	318	274	47	43
Bell	338	247	324	266	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bexar	1,038	723	786	976	...	...	766	991	1,024	734
Blanco	106	49	113	45	...	...	118	42	91	66
Bosque	146	31	126	66	...	...	127	53	133	60
Bowie	111	279	46	135	10	370	...	...	23	338
Brazoria	120	307	107	326	...	...	118	309	161	257
Brazos	201	78	196	85	...	...	188	82	195	82
Brown	24	1	24	2	...	...	27	1	28	1
Burleson	423	271	378	293	...	...	373	289	292	364
Burnett	294	70	293	94	...	...	285	93	220	158
Caldwell	283	289	269	303	...	...	295	302	214	331
Calhoun	193	138	...	...	...	...	146	179	135	192
Cameron	97	332	31	521	...	...	4	418	21	403
Cass	578	626	479	683	...	...	756	252	561	585
Chambers	88	59	58	90	38	99	...	...	61	80

Cherokee	933	711	805	751	284	1,065	...	...	843	730
Collin	665	454	628	480	3	1,111	...	...	346	730
Colorado	345	275	359	283	...	...	357	273	377	256
Comal	39	346	28	359	...	...	36	359	40	357
Comanche	89	10	94	19	...	...	100	25	77	43
Cooke	315	107	280	127	24	375	...	...	221	163
Coryell	216	52	207	102	...	...	208	101	233	85
Dallas	545	429	402	558	70	894	...	...	411	578
Denton	517	135	466	175	12	628	...	...	281	340
De Witt	228	259	192	277	...	...	204	281	205	277
Ellis	357	259	330	287	271	308	...	...	280	330
El Paso	65	465	37	468	...	...	57	467	220	298
Erath	250	13	252	19	...	...	209	23	244	19
Falls	237	109	219	124	...	...	218	112	207	132
Fannin	719	414	567	529	26	1,113	...	...	484	628
Fayette	604	526	585	550	...	...	566	551	353	727
Fort Bend	188	176	139	214	...	...	173	172	167	184
Freestone	295	277	258	308	...	...	250	305	210	332
Galveston	321	433	276	491	...	...	337	400	119	651
Gillespie	90	102	44	175	...	...	69	147	111	104
Goliad	226	137	204	143	...	...	198	133	191	169
Gonzales	493	407	462	433	...	...	450	427	424	449
Graystone	639	429	567	440	25	958	...	...	470	463
Grimes	465	254	410	288	...	...	419	254	181	486
Guadalupe	251	287	231	309	...	...	229	318	219	298
Hamilton	43	2	30	10	...	...	43	7	28	25
Harris	829	626	717	728	...	...	836	598	70	1,342

STATE TICKET—ELECTION RETURNS, 1859—Continued

Counties	Governor		Lieutenant-Governor		Congress (District I)		Congress (District II)		Land Commissioner	
	*Op. party Sam Houston	Dem. party H. R. Runnels	Op. party Edward Clark	Dem. party Francis Lubbock	Op. party W. B. Ochiltree	Dem. party J. H. Reagan	Op. party A. J. Hamilton	Dem. party T. N. Waul	Op. party Stephen Crosby	Dem. party F. M. White
Harrison	560	495	487	499	...	...	...	...	670	348
Hays	164	74	159	78	...	...	145	79	136	101
Henderson	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Hidalgo	3	227	3	227	...	...	3	227	...	230
Hill	250	161	215	192	...	...	216	170	208	173
Hopkins	584	500	479	504	53	991	...	...	418	606
Houston	450	354	302	463	87	681	...	...	375	400
Hunt	403	440	244	536	18	796	...	...	239	536
Jack	100	12	95	18	3	115	...	...	97	33
Jackson	143	60	138	59	...	...	141	57	30	177
Jasper	244	162	197	174	17	335	...	...	141	238
Jefferson	66	82	48	97	24	98	...	...	58	85
Johnson	303	118	247	159	...	...	249	134	274	146
Karnes	165	67	155	76	...	...	150	81	153	75
Kaufman	383	266	301	213	91	514	...	...	385	260
Kerr	47	11	38	24	...	...	31	32	33	32
Lamar	484	549	438	563	25	996	...	...	222	625
Lampasas	221	65	210	78	...	...	212	64	157	112
Lavaca	336	342	334	331	...	...	329	330	326	353
Leon	421	361	408	364	...	...	374	379	425	335
Liberty	152	210	101	238	52	273	...	...	133	231
Limestone	272	314	216	364	...	...	218	335	304	254
Live Oak	58	43	50	53	...	...	36	60	51	46

STATE TICKET—ELECTION RETURNS, 1859—Continued

Counties	Governor		Lieutenant-Governor		Congress (District I)		Congress (District II)		Land Commissioner	
	*Op. party Sam Houston	Dem. party H. R. Runnels	Op. party Edward Clark	Dem. party Francis Lubbock	Op. party W. B. Ochiltree	Dem. party J. H. Reagan	Op. party A. J. Hamilton	Dem. party T. N. Waul	Op. party Stephen Crosby	Dem. party F. M. White
Llano	89	43	75	63	...	...	81	76	45	98
McLennan	408	190	372	228	...	...	348	228	360	227
Madison	190	90	174	92	...	...	168	93	110	139
Mason	21	10	23	15	...	...	...	...	...	...
Matagorda	79	149	64	168	...	...	63	168	129	111
Medina	54	197	51	200	...	...	58	199	101	151
Milam	330	218	303	217	...	...	317	208	296	237
Montague	75	8	58	9	...	...	...	...	...	...
Montgomery	299	153	279	167	...	...	262	177	212	206
Nacogdoches	715	308	706	262	226	638	...	...	702	232
Navarro	402	277	365	310	...	...	370	301	423	241
Newton	154	116	142	118	20	218	...	...	76	181
Nueces	233	105(?)	186	172	...	...	225	139	259	111
Orange	122	46	88	67	46	.109	...	...	65	78
Palo Pinto	170	15	150	36	...	...	151	28	149	44
Panola	429	433	365	448	74	630	...	...	406	425
Parker	598	119	527	196	...	...	495	193	509	235
Polk	298	312	252	345	49	534	...	...	190	400
Red River	474	405	440	415	18	835	...	...	325	537
Refugio	82	77	66	95	...	...	87	72	60	98
Robertson	259	160	236	190	...	...	229	185	225	175
Rusk	918	968	835	1,015	173	1,476	...	...	698	1,101

Sabine	201	27	197	18	62	147	...	...	189	35
San Augustine	273	109	259	117	13	368	...	...	242	144
San Patricio	21	33	15	30	...	...	17	31	16	36
San Saba	158	9	158	11	...	...	158	14	122	43
Shelby	453	275	396	316	50	635	...	...	374	343
Smith	801	466	583	571	233	903	...	...	382	752
Starr	69	191	113	147	...	...	117	145	128	134
Tarrant	596	118	448	214	...	...	448	233	377	236
Titus	555	489	529	545	37	956	...	...	295	724
Travis	590	403	594	439	...	...	595	428	541	482
Trinity	341	167	313	183	94	374	...	...	247	244
Tyler	233	352	190	361	30	525	...	...	202	351
Upshur	552	505	469	537	162	730	...	...	499	512
Uvalde	66	44	49	28	...	...	51	26	43	39
Van Zandt	210	165	122	224	36	340	...	...	256	139
Victoria	123	181	103	196	...	...	114	190	81	223
Walker	470	344	460	349	...	...	435	345	330	441
Washington	745	607	658	676	...	...	641	678	457	863
Webb	110	90	114	89	...	...	116	86	117	83
Wise	310	23	301	28	81	239	...	...	285	38
Wharton	93	114	63	123	...	...	82	119	98	103
Williamson	488	187	475	199	...	...	458	204	310	332
Wood	403	250	390	259	76	558	...	...	393	265
Young	109	42	97	48	...	93	7	15	82	57
Zapata	42	130	42	130	...	...	42	130	42	131
Total	36,227	27,500	31,458	30,325	3,464	23,977	17,198	16,007	28,328	33,303

Reference: Records of the Executive Office, H. R. Runnels' Administration, pp. 355-357; 388-391.

* Opposition Party

The campaign of 1859 was a source of great encouragement to the opposition party in Texas as well as in other states.

The *Journal* (Louisville, Ky.), a Know-Nothing paper, was jubilant over the election of Houston. Alluding to the canvass, it stated:

> Luckily, at this juncture, there arose the question of reviving the African slave trade, with all its unmitigated horrors and this test has restored Houston to his old position, and defeated the malignant sectionalist. The Democrats took a tolerably fair course, but their candidate for governor was a known advocate of the slave trade, while Houston openly and fearlessly opposed it. This has been the issue in Texas and on it Houston is elected Governor.[168]

After the campaign of 1859, other and more important matters absorbing popular thought, Know-Nothingism as a party issue disappeared. The success of the freesoilers in Kansas, the refusal of the North to abide by the Dred Scott decision, and the John Brown's raid on Harper's Ferry had precipitated secession sentiments among the Democrats in the State. In their resolutions adopted at the State convention, held in Galveston, April, 1860, they declared that in case of encroachment upon its rights by the federal government, Texas, still a sovereign state, possessed the right to revoke its delegated powers, to annul the compact, and to withdraw from the Union.[169] The opposition press and party headed by Sam Houston and his friends took a positive stand against secession. In the presidential campaign of 1860, the latter, like all the best known Nativists of the South, supported Bell and Everett who were running on a Constitutional Union Ticket,[170] while the Democrats favored the Breckenridge-Lane ticket. However, Lincoln's election fanned the flame of sectional hatred. Resolutions favoring secession were adopted in all parts of the State; and February 1, 1861, a State convention adopted an Ordinance of Secession by a vote of 152 to 6. It was submitted to the vote of the people who ratified it on February 23, 1861. That act brought to a close another period in Texas History.[171]

[168] *Texas Republican*, Sept. 17, 1859.
[169] Winkler, 82.
[170] Winkler, 87-88.
[171] Winkler, 88-93.

Summary

This chapter has traced the history of the Know-Nothing party in Texas from its first foothold in the State in 1854 until its final disappearance in 1860. As in other states its first political activities were municipal in character. With a view to gain state control, the Know-Nothing party held a state convention on July 11, 1855, at which it adopted a ticket for the public offices of the state and made immediate preparation for the campaign of 1855. These activities on the part of the Know-Nothings roused the Democrats to action. The latter held mass meetings in various parts of the state at which they denounced the Know-Nothing party's secrecy of action, its proscriptive measures, and its divesting its members of their freedom of choice in matters political.

During the animated campaign of 1855 the anti-German and the anti-Catholic hostility was strong. The Germans were decried as a traitorous people and the Catholic Church as a foe to political freedom. The salient features of Houston's letter of identification with Know-Nothingism gave rise to adverse comments on the part of the Democratic press and to the adoption of condemnatory resolutions at mass meetings.

The national campaign of 1856 was very lively; both parties were well organized and each of them had its national, state, and county ticket. This vigorous contest terminated in a decisive Democratic victory, which gave the death blow to the Know-Nothing party in the state. Nevertheless Know-Nothingism survived the party. In 1857 the Know-Nothings supported an Independent state ticket, the personnel of which had all been Know-Nothings. In 1858 they again gave signs that they were still a force in state politics.

In 1859 the Know-Nothings fused with the dissatisfied Democrats and formed an opposition party in the campaign of 1859. This campaign was centered around the question of reopening the African slave trade. Although this was a false issue, it was instrumental in winning a signal victory for the opposition party. However, the existence of the latter was short-lived, disappearing with the advent of the Civil War.

CONCLUSION

In my first chapter I attempted to sketch the general development of nativism in its essential features of hatred of the Catholic Church and hatred of the foreigner, particularly the Catholic foreigner, down to 1860. This sketch, however, was mainly confined to nativism in the North. It will be well here then, in conclusion, to summarize the development of the movement in Texas, a development which so far as I have been able to discover had rather close parallels in other parts of the South; and further to indicate any peculiar aspects of Texas and Southern nativism in general that differentiates it from the nativistic movement in the North as presented in the first chapter. It should be stated at once, however, that there is no question here of seeking for essential differences between Texas nativism and that in the North. The Americans who entered Texas brought with them their common inheritance of prejudice to Catholicism and the foreigner. We have rather to seek the inevitable modifications which are produced in a movement by a different environment.

About 1825 the racial animosity between the Mexican and the American made itself markedly evident. This spirit of animosity fostered by political, religious, and economic grievances led to a sharp cleavage between the American and Mexican elements, which culminated in the independence of Texas in 1836.

With the establishment of the Republic, foreign hostility was incorporated in 1837 in a land act and in an act debarring foreigners from office. These laws, however, were soon abrogated, for Texas needed an industrious people to cultivate her wilderness and a population for her growth and defense as a nation.

The year 1843 marked the beginning of a second anti-foreign wave in Texas, revealing itself in an opposition to the contract system of colonization, and later in a number of reports and debates in the constitutional convention of 1845. This opposition was based on the fear that the European immigrant as soon as he had acquired sufficient strength would abolish slavery.

But, for a time, annexation and the Mexican War crowded nativistic tendencies from the field.

The great nativistic movement, which swept the whole country in the decade before the Civil War, began in Texas in 1854 with the establishment of the Know-Nothing party in the state. This party holding up the high ideals of protecting American institutions from foreign injurious influence made a strong appeal to the slaveholders who saw the influx of immigrants daily adding to the preponderance of the free states of the North. The anti-Know-Nothings in Texas, perceiving the real motives underlying the movement, fought it as an illegal and tyrannical force prejudicial to the fundamental principles of American Government. A collapse of the party, already prepared by disagreement on the question of slavery, followed the national campaign of 1856, in which the hopeless position of Know-Nothingism in national politics was only too clearly demonstrated. In an informal way, however, nativism continued to exercise its influence in state politics in Texas until in 1860 it was banished from men's minds by the approach of the struggle for Southern independence.

What were the effects of nativism in Texas? Its evil effects for the most part were purely temporary. On the other hand, undeniable benefits followed from the movement, although these benefits were certainly unforeseen by its promoters.

In the religious field it led to a better understanding of the Catholic Church, its members, and its work. It was brought home to many of the best citizens that the Catholic Church is not a menace to American political institutions, and that membership in the Catholic Church is not prejudicial to the highest ideals of American citizenship. To the Catholic Church itself nativism gave an impetus that resulted in a more closely-knit organization and a readier adaptation by its foreign-communicants to the social and civil environment in which they were living.

In the political and social fields nativism gave one great compensation for the havoc it wrought in its progress. It had attained its greatest strength politically in those sections of the state where un-assimilated groups of foreigners were found. In attacking these groups it hastened the inevitable process of their Americanization. This fact is strikingly evident in the Ger-

man communities, which for self-protection and preservation of their own national customs were forced to take an active part in Texas politics. Furthermore, Know-Nothingism was one of the most important factors in the development of party lines in Texas. Under the Mexican Government there was no political alignment in Texas. In the Texas Republic there were the Sam Houston and anti-Sam Houston factions; while as a state in the Union up to 1855 party organization was loose and political campaigns were personal in character—men, not policies, were the determining factors. With the advent of Know-Nothingism the order was reversed, party organization perfected, and a more lively interest was taken in national affairs.

APPENDIX

SAM HOUSTON'S LETTER OF IDENTIFICATION WITH KNOW-NOTHINGISM

(Written from his home in Independence, Texas, July 24, 1855)

Gentlemen—Your letter of yesterday's date was presented to me early in the afternoon. At the present time I feel no hesitancy in expressing my opinion in relation to the American Order; or its principles. I feel that my fellow-citizens, in whose service I have been so long engaged, are entitled to my views, which in their opinion may, in any way, affect the public interest. At an earlier period of the State canvass, it might have been charged upon me, that I was endeavoring to influence the elections in our State; but as the election is so near at hand, that my opinions cannot have general circulation, I cannot be charged with interferance (sic).

You may rest assured, that in relying on my candor and sincerity, you will meet with no disappointment. Owing to the heated state of the public mind, the influence of Federal patronage, and the desperate efforts which are making to smother American sentiment and quiet the upheavings of the American mind, I, expect to receive a full share of vituperation and abuse. A belief, too, that the election in Virginia has strangled the efforts of the American people, in regaining their legitimate rights and vindicating their inherent principles, is, to my belief, fallacious. I regard the result in the Virginia election as highly encouraging to the principles of the Order. The efforts were of the most herculean and untiring order, within the State and aided and backed by the Federal patronage. In a party contest in the State, an interference on the part of the Federal administration would have been deemed an outrage—as it is, the old orthodox state of Virginia has received and recognized the rights of Federal interference in her State election. The Democracy of Virginia will yet awake to the proper appreciation of the rights of their commonwelth (sic) and the extinction of Federal power.

In treating of a subject which has been so generally and elaborately discussed as that of the American order, it would be difficult to present anything original in the way of argument—hence my aim will be to offer my deductions and conclusions from the facts and arguments of others and to glance at the causas (sic) which have given rise to the present excitement. The movement, I regard as one growing out of a great crisis in the affairs of our nation, and the precursor of a sound, healthful and vigorous nationality, which will be commensurate to solve and carry out the great principles of free government, and to prevent the liberties of our country from being destroyed, by the machinations of demagogue and factionist, whilst they continue to chant the Syren song of "No danger," at the same time they cry out, beware of the danger of secret societies. It is true that secret societies have always been dangerous to despots and tyrants. They have even denounced and proscribed Masonry. The Pope with other potentates have crushed the ancient Order in their dominions. In our own country we have seen the portals leading into the sacred temples, for a while closed and deserted. Secret societies were then denounced. Thank heaven, that cloud of fanaticism, which for a while overshadowed it, has been dispelled by the light of reason and it still continues to extend the blessing of its principles to thousands of desolate widows and orphans.

The opponents of the American order exclaim, it is a political association! and therefore ought not to be secret. I reply, yes, it is secret, and its name denotes its object. Is it the first secret political society which has been organized in the United States? It is as well known as any other historical truth, that Gen. Washington and many of his compatriots of the revolution were members of the Cincinnati society, in which, if I am not under misapprehension, no man is eligible to membership, even now unless he is a native American, since the heroes who fought in the revolution passed off the stage of life. Was not this a secret society? Was it not purely political? Was not General Washington at the time of his death president of this society? I should really like to know what the anti-Americans think of this scrap of history. They cannot deny it. Then I

will ask them, what danger has grown out of this secret political society? Is this the only secret political society which has existed in our country for more than half a century? The Columbia order—known as the Tammany Society, highly influential, maintains its existence without danger to the liberties of the country. Gen. Jackson was a member of this society and I know prominent statesmen throughout the nation, who are members of it, and as I myself am one, and understand its principles, I can assert, they are patriotic and national. What say the anti-Americans of these facts?

Can any sane man believe that Gen. Washington or Gen. Jackson would have united with any association, or order not purely American? Would either have entered into any political league when secrecy was enjoined, if he had not approved of the principles of secrecy in political associations? From my knowledge of the character of Washington, the sacrifices he made for his country, united with his fervent patriotism, and his preference for everything American, I cannot doubt for one moment if he were now living, he would cheerfully sanction the principles of the Know-Nothing order. From my personal and familiar knowledge of the principles of Gen. Jackson, I am confident, that, were he living, to counteract the policy of European potentates and statesmen, to throw upon our shores their refuse population of convicts and paupers, to prevent (sic) our ballot boxes and populate our poorhouses, he would most cordially sanction and inculcate the principles of the American Order. The instances which I have given of secret political associations, are not the only ones which have existed in our country and which have been, and continue to be, practiced by the two political parties.

Are not secret caucuses continually held by the political leaders of both parties in Congress? "O yes, it will be answered? very true! but there is a necessity for this. We have to take care of our parties, to form plans for the people to carry out. And if we did not make platforms for them, they would not know how to vote upon important subjects." This explains much of the opposition to the present movement of the people. The action of the American order is only the pulsations (sic) of the

American heart, which forces liberty through the heart of the masses, and will cause them to reclaim that power and influence which the arts of demagogues and assumptions of "party leaders," have appropriated to themselves and generally allow the people to cast their votes in accordance with their caucus decisions, whether secret or open. Should the American movement succeed, as it must, if our liberties are to be preserved, many good easy souls who feel seated in power, will have to yield that power, which has been used in directing the people to carry out their edicts, prepared in caucus and proclaimed in convention.

The cry of abolitionism has been raised by the anti-American party in the South, for no other purpose than to alarm their fears and strangle the American feeling. Have not the two parties for years past charged each other with being identified with abolitionists, as it suited party interest? The American order have (sic) given their platforms to the world. I perceive by the intelligence of the day that one of the oldest Democratic statesmen, the standard-bearer of the party, Gen. Cass, has approved of the platform of the American order, as proclaimed to the world by the convention at Philadelphia.

From fifty to fifty-four, abolitionism appeared to have died away. Its notes were seldom heard; or if heard, not heeded. The compromise of fifty had silenced agitation, and the last congress at its meeting, though composed of nearly three hundred members, claimed but four avowed abolitionists in both Houses. Now they are formidable in numbers! What has produced this wonderful revolution? Was it not brought about under Democratic administration, which came into power by a greater majority than any preceding one, where there was a contest? Is it now powerful? "What first broke it down and built up the freesoil and abolition party against it? Was it not the Nebraska Bill? Does anyone acquainted with the facts doubt it?" Was not this measure concocted in a secret caucus of seven persons? It surely was endorsed by the President, and by his influence carried through Congress in violation of the platform of both political parties, proclaimed at Baltimore. Had not the President given reiterated pledges that he would discourage the agita-

tion of the slavery question in and out of Congress, and elsewhere? Were those pledges redeemed by him? Was not this measure the first thing to renew agitation since 1850? No candid man can suppose the contrary.

It was regarded by moderate men at the North, good Democrats, who always stood by the South, as a breach of good faith, and they either opposed the administration, or would not give it their support. This measure caused audible expression of disapprobation by many who aided in electing the President; but there were other causes, and all united, gave rise to the American order. The selection of the President's Cabinet, although it was highly exceptionable to the Democratic party, they made an effort to swallow it. General discontent was growing up in the country. This feeling was aggravated by a report that an agreement was made between a Catholic Bishop and Gen. Pierce—conditioned that Gen. Pierce was to receive the Catholic vote, and in the event of his election, a situation in his Cabinet should be given to a member of the Catholic denomination. As this was published, and not denied, it was believed. Nor was this all. Foreigners were selected to fill important missions to foreign governments, to the exclusion of distinguished American statesmen. About this time it was ascertained that an unusual number of convicts and paupers were thrown upon our shore from European prisons and poorhouses. The belief obtained that these classes of immigrants were thrust upon us by the policy of foreign governments who never can bear us good will as long as we remain a free and independent people. These facts in connection with general discontent towards the administration, with threats made in Catholic newspapers and periodicals, seemed at once to arouse the people, and admonish them to prepare for the apprehended contest. The cry was then raised by the anti-Americans that the object of the American order was the proscription of Catholics and foreigners. This I deny. The threats and denunciations came from Catholic journals, which gave the alarm to Protestants and Americans. The design of the American order is not to put down Catholics, but to prevent Catholics putting down Protestants. The members of the order would not, nor do they intend to interfere with

the Catholic religion, or their mode of worship; but at the same time we are not willing to place power in the hands of those who acknowledge or owe temporal allegiance to any foreign prince, king or potentate. Again, it is said, the principles of the American order proscribe foreigners and are intended to extend the period of naturalization. I do not regard this principle as proscriptive. I understand foreigners are to be protected in the full enjoyment of all their civil rights and of exercising whatever religious opinions, or mode of worship, they prefer. No one wishes to abridge those privileges.

The possession and exercise of political rights are distinct matters. Females and minors possess and enjoy civil rights, yet they are not capable of exercising the political right of suffrage. This is a Constitutional right, to those who are not natives is a matter of grace and favor of the Congress, and of the Constitution.

Congress has the power to invest foreigners with the right under such conditions as may be thought proper and expedient for the well being (sic) of the republic.

The teachers of the modern School, who claim to be the only democrats or patriots in the country admit that some modification of the naturalization laws might be well enough. They take care not to say how far they are willing to go. Are they willing to extend the period of probation to twenty-one years? If they are not, I am. If such laws were passed they could not affect those who are already naturalized, and who enjoy the full benefits of our institutions. Nor would it prejudice the claims of those who might have reached the American soil at the time of the passage, or going into operation of such laws. Such a measure, I should think, ought to be hailed by naturalized foreigners and those whose claims to naturalization have commenced with as much joy as if they were native Americans. If not on their own account, they should at least, hail it on account of their children. The foreigners who have been naturalized in our country are generally of a class, who would feel it a poor compliment paid them to place convicts and paupers on a footing of equality with them; or to say that such beings were entitled to the consideration which are due the naturalized citizens.

I am in favor of excluding from our shores persons who can-

not come to the country with a certificate from our consular agents in the country which they leave, representing them as persons of good character; or if they have been guilty of political offences in their country, to state the same, that a proper allowance might be made by our government. I am becoming suspicious of the teachers in these days of utilitarian politics. And before I enlist under the leaders of modern democracy I wish to know of them whether they stand on the Jackson or Calhoun platform. Between their platforms there was an essential difference. Jackson's was the Constitution and the Union. This is the platform upon which I stand, and if, as has been asserted, the American party is down, the battle over, and victory won, I shall only feel mortified to witness at my period of life, after having looked upon so many vicissitudes of my country, to see an anti-American feeling triumph. One consolation, at least, will be left. Whilst the triumphs of American principles were reverberating throughout the Union I was silent. When those principles are said to be in eclipse I come forward with cheerfulness and declare that I believe that the salvation of my country is only to be secured by adherence to the principles of the American order.

A triumph is claimed by anti-Americans, based on the suppositions that all councils will be broken up, from the fact that some withdrawals have and may continue to take place. In all cases within my knowledge where withdrawals have occurred, a greater number were (sic) added to the order than seceders. Occasionally men have joined the order from motives which did little credit to their principles, and remained members for months. Their motives can only be inferred from their actions. They remained quietly until nominations were made, in which they were not so fortunate as they much desired to be. Those persons soon after withdrew from the order, denouncing it as an "Unholy, Dark-Lantern Society."

We have a high and holy duty to perform to our country, and if we, as Americans, cannot maintain and preserve our freedom, is it possible, or even probable, that we will find a safer depository in the hands of foreigners; or the satelites (sic) of a pope? Whose system of religion pursues all American Protestants with

denunciations while living, and denies their bodies burial after death in Catholic countries . . .

State Gazette, Aug. 18, 1855.

OATHS TAKEN BY THE KNOW-NOTHING PARTY

The first-degree oath designed to control the voting citizen was administered as follows:

In the presence of Almighty God and these witnesses, you do solemnly promise and swear that you never will betray any of the secrets of this society, nor communicate them even to proper candidates, except within a lawful Council of the Order; that you never will permit any of the secrets of this society to be written, or in any other manner to be made legible, except for the purpose of official instruction; that you will not vote, nor give your influence for any man for office in the gift of the people, unless he be a native-born citizen, in favor of Americans ruling America, nor if he be a Roman Catholic, that you will, in all political matters, so far as this Order is concerned, comply with the will of the majority, though it may conflict with your personal preference, so long as it does not conflict with the Constitution of the United States of America or that of the State in which you reside; that you will not under any circumstances expose the name of any member of this order, nor reveal the existence of such an association; that you will answer an imperative notice issued by the proper authority; obey the command of the State Council, President or his Deputy, while assembled by such notice, and respond to the claim of a sign or cry of the Order, unless it be physically impossible; and that you will acknowledge the State Council of ———— as the legitimate head, the ruling authority, and the supreme tribunal of the Order in the State of ———— under the jurisdiction of the National Council of the United States of North America. . . .

Taken from *Texas Republican,* July 18, 1857.

The second-degree oath bound the taker as to his policy if advanced to public office. It was administered thus:

. . . That you will support in all political matters for all political offices, members of this Order, in preference to other persons; that if it may be done legally, you will when elected or appointed to any

official station conferring on you the power to do so, remove all foreigners, aliens or Roman Catholics from office or place, and that you will in no case, appoint such to any office or place in your gift. You do also promise and swear that this and all other obligations which you have previously taken in this Order, shall ever be kept through life sacred and inviolate. All this you promise and declare, as Americans, to sustain and abide by, without any hesitation or mental reservation whatever. So help you God and keep you steadfast.—*Texas Republican,* July 18, 1857.

The third-degree oath was frequently called the Union degree oath because it contained a clause referring to the Union. It was administered as follows:

You and each of you, of your own free will and accord, in the presence of Almighty God and these witnesses, with your hands joined in token of that fraternal affection which should ever bind together the States of this Union, forming a ring, in token of your determination that, so far as your efforts can avail, this Union shall have no end, do solemnly and sincerely swear (or affirm) that you will not, under any circumstances, disclose in any manner nor suffer it to be done by others if in your power to prevent it, the name, signs, passwords or other secrets of this Degree, except to those to whom you may prove on trial to be brothers of the same Degree, or in open council for the purpose of instruction; that you do hereby solemnly declare your devotion to the Union of these States; that in the discharge of your duty as American citizens you will uphold, maintain, and defend it; that you will discourage and discountenance any attempt coming from any and every quarter, which you believe to be designed or calculated to destroy, or subvert it, or to weaken its bonds; and that you will use your influence, in endeavoring to procure an amicable and equitable adjustment of all political discontents or differences, which may threaten its injury or overthrow. You do further promise and swear (or affirm) that you will not vote for any one to fill any office of honor, or profit, or trust of a political character, whom you know or believe to be in favor of a dissolution of the Union of these States, or who is endeavoring to produce that result; that you will vote for and support for all political offices Third or Union Degree members of this Order, in preference to all others; that if it may be done consistently with the Constitution and laws of the land, you will when elected or appointed to any official station, which may confer on you the power to do so, remove from office or place, all persons whom you know or

believe to be in favor of a dissolution of the Union, or who are endeavoring to produce that result; and that you will in no case appoint such persons to any political office or place whatever. All this you promise and swear (or affirm) upon your honor as American citizens and friends of the American Union, to sustain and abide by without any hesitation or mental reservation whatever. You also promise and swear (or affirm) that this, and all other obligations which you have previously taken in this Order shall ever be kept sacred and inviolate. To all this you pledge your lives, your fortunes, and your sacred honors. So help you God and keep you steadfast.—*Texas State Times,* June 16, 1855.

GERMAN MASS MEETING IN SAN ANTONIO

May 15, 1854

Declaration of Principles

Indem wir von der Überzeugung, ausgehen, dass das Volk der Vereinigten Staaten weder die Freiheit geniesst, welche ihm die Verfassung verspricht seiner Macht und Ausdehnung gemäss, dem Auslande gegenüber, zukommt, und in dem wir erkannt haben, dass die bestehenden Parteien weder den Willen noch die Kraft haben, die politischen, sozialen und religiösen Verhältnisse der Vereinigten Staaten den Wünschen einer grossen Zahl amerikanischer Bürger entsprechend zu verbessern, haben wir uns unter Aufstellung einer Reihe von Grundsätzen dahin vereinigt, dass wir von den sich voraussichtlich neu bildenden Parteien mit derjenigen Hand in Hand gehen werden, welche uns die meisten Garantien zur Verwirklichung unserer Forderungen bietet.

Hiermit verwahren wir uns zugleich ausdrücklich gegen jeden Vorwurf, als sei es unsere Absicht, eine "deutsche Partei" zu bilden, und erklären, dass unsere Vereinigung als Deutsche lediglich einen sprachlichen Grund hat.

A. Politische Reform

1. Die Verfassung der Vereinigten Staaten ist die beste der jetzt bestehenden. Sie ist jedoch, wie alles Bestehende, einer weiteren Entwickelung fähig und bedürftig. Wir fordern daher:
   a. Direkte Wahl der Präsidenten und Senatoren durch das Volk;
   b. Wahl der Richter, der Post-, Steuer- und aller Administrativ-Beamten, mit Ausnahme der Kabinets-Mitglieder und Besandten durch das Volk;
   c. Absetzbarkeit der Beamten, nicht aus Partei-Rücksichten, sondern nur wegen Unfähigkeit oder Pflichtverletzung, nach Gesetz und Recht;
   d. Wahlbarkeit ohne Rücksicht auf den Wohnort des zu Wählenden;
   e. Recht der Wähler, die Abgeordneten, deren Wirksamkeit sie nicht befriedigt, durch Majoritatis-Beschluss zurück zu rufen.
2. Um den Vereinigten Staaten eine würdige Stellung dem Auslande gegenüber zu geben und ihren Einfluss auf die Entwickelung der Freiheit geltend zu machen, fordern wir:
   a. Anerkennung und Aufrechterhaltung republikanischer Staaten durch tatige Hilfe;
   b. Ausreichenden Schutz amerikanischer Staatsbürger im Auslande;
   c. Aufrechterhaltung der Monroe-Doctrin;
   d. Aufhebung aller Auslieferungs-Verträge.
3. Die Streitmacht zur See und zu Lande ist eine Institut zum Schutze des Landes und seiner Bürger und erheischt desshalb Anerkennung und Einrichtung derselben als eines volkstümlichen Staatskörpers. Desshalb fordern wir:
   a. Nur Bürger und Staats-Angehörige, welche ihre Deklaration seit mindestens einem Jahre abgegeben haben, dürfen Soldat sein;

b. Abschaffung jeder Körperstrafe;

c. Der Soldat soll in Friedenszeiten wie ein Bürger gerichtet werden;

d. Einrichtung von Bildungs-Anstalten für gediente Soldaten zu Offizieren und Staats-bildung für Offiziere in Theorie und Praxis.

B. Soziale Reform

1. Die Gestezgebung und Gerechtigkeitspflege haben zum Zweck, die Rechte des Bürgers den Anforderungen des Zeitgeistes gemäss weiter zu entwickeln und zu schützen. Die Strafe soll nicht weiter gehen als solcher Schutz erheischt. Darum fordern wir:

   a. Allgemein Kriminal und Civil Gesetze, welche durch Einfachheit und Bestimmtheit jedem Bürger verständlich sind und die Aushilfe der Advokaten entbehrlich machen;

   b. Gegenüberstellung des Klagers dem Beklagten und somit Abschaffung der Grand Jury;

   c. Abschaffung der Schuldhaft;

   d. Ein bestimmtes zum Lebensunterhalt notwendiges Besitztum soll dem gerichtlichen Verkaufe nicht unterworfen sein;

   e. Gleichstellung der Arbeit mit dem Kapital in allen darauf bezüglichen Gesetzen;

   f. Abschaffung der Todesstrafe;

   g. Weitere Gesetze zur Beförderung und zum besseren Schutze der Einwanderer;

   h. Aufhebung aller Temperenz-Gesetze.

2. Die Sklaverei ist ein Übel, dessen entliche Beseitigung den Grundsätzen der Demokratik gemäss, notwendig ist; da sie aber nur einzelne Staaten betrifft, so fordern wir:

   Dass die Bundes-Regierung sich aller Einmischung in Sachen der Sklaverei enthült, dass aber, wenn ein einzelner Staat die Beseitigung dieses Übels beschliessen wird, als-

dann zur Ausführung des Beschlosses die Bundeshilfe in Anspruch genommen werden kann.

3. Grund und Boden soll kein Gegenstand der Spekulation sein, sondern als Mittel zur Verwertung der Arbeitskraft betrachtet werden; deshalb fordern wir:
   a. Dass nicht bloss jedem Bürger, sondern auch jedem Staats-Angehörigen auf Verlangen ein angemessenes Stück offentlichen Landes zur selbsteigenen Benutzung unentgeltlich übergeben werden;
   b. Aufhebung jeder Veräusserung von Staatsländern an Andere als wirkliche Ansiedler.
4. Die Steuern haben keinen anderen Zweck, als die Kosten der Redierung zu bestreiten, sind also lediglich nach der Höhe dieser Kosten zu bestimmen und müssen den Vermögensverhältnissen gemäss möglichst gleich verteilt werden; darum fordern wir:
   a. Direkte Besteurung;
   b. Einkommensteuer in der Weise, dass das gröszere Einkommen verhältnismässig höher besteuert wird;
   c. Progressive Erbschaftssteuer;
   d. Höhere Besteuerung des unkultivierten Landes, um den Landwucher zu beschränken;
   e. Möglichste Handelsfreiheit.
5. Banken können nur den Zweck haben, unbemittelten Schutz gegen die Macht des Kapitals zu gewähren und den Handel zu unterstützen; darum fordern wir:
   a. Aufhebung der Banken in ihrer jetzigen Einrichtung;
   b. Einrichtung von Kreditinstituten auf sicherer Grundlage.
6. Innere Verbesserung insofern solche von allgemeinen Nutzen sind, müssen zwar der Bundesregierung überlassen bleiben, doch fordern wir:
   a. Ausführung derselben durch Privatindustrie und öffentliche Überwachung und Garantie der Kontrakte mit den Arbeitern.

7. Der Staat hat die Pflicht für die Erziehung der Jugend zu republikanischen Staatsbürgern Sorge zu tragen, und alle hemmenden Einflüsse auf die Erziehung so viel als möglich zu beseitigen; darum fordern wir:

   a. Freie Schulen lediglich aus Staatsmitteln;

   b. Gänzlichen Ausschluss des Religionsunterrichtes und der Religionsbücher aus den Schulen;

   c. Kein Lehrer darf Geistlicher sein;

   d. Kein Kind darf dem Unterricht der Freischule entzogen werden, wenn nicht der Nachweiss geführt wird, dass ein genügender Unterrichtsersatz auf andere Weise gesichert wird;

   e. Einrichtung von Universitäten, wo jeder dem Unterrichte unentgeltlich beiwohnen kann;

   f. Staatsprüfung für Lehrer, Ärzte und Apotheker.

C. Religions Reform

Die Religion ist rein Privatsache. Die Vereinigten Staaten sind politische Staaten und haben kein Recht sich in Religions-Angelegenheiten zu mischen, weder hemmend noch bevorzugend; desshalb fordern wir:

   a. Abschaffung des religiösen Eides;

   b. Aufhebung der Sonntagsgesetze und Bettage oder Danksagungstage;

   c. Kongress und Representatenversammlungen sollen nicht durch Gebete eröffnet werden.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

A. Manuscripts

Colonization Papers of the Republic of Texas (1839-1845). Archives, Texas State Library.

Official Correspondence of Governor E. M. Pease (1855-1857). Archives, Texas State Library.

Official Correspondence of Governor H. R. Runnels (1857-1859). Archives, Texas State Library.

Records of the Executive Office of E. M. Pease's Administration (Dec. 21, 1855-Dec, 21, 1857). Archives, Texas State Library.

Records of the Executive Office of H. R. Runnels' Administration (Dec. 21, 1857-Dec. 21, 1859). Archives, Texas State Library.

B. Printed Sources

1. Books

A Political Text-Book for 1860, H. Greeley and J. F. Cleveland (editors). New York, 1860. (Includes all national platforms to 1860.)

Austin Papers, 3 vols., Eugene C. Barker (editor). Washington, D. C., 1924-1928.

Berichte der Leopoldinen-Stiftung im Kaiserthume Oesterreich 1833-1860.

Brownlow, William G., Americanism Contrasted with Foreignism, Romanism and Bogus Democracy. Nashville, 1856. (A violent anti-Catholic treatment by a Southern minister.)

Butler, Charles, The Book of the Roman Catholic Church. Baltimore, 1834. (In the appendix there is a reprint of the documents containing the opinions of the Catholic Universities of Europe on the temporal power of the papacy.)

Castro, Henry, Le Texas. Anvers, 1845.

Castro, Lorenzo, Immigration from Alsace and Lorraine. New York, 1871. (A brief sketch of the history of Castro's colony in Western Texas. Lorenzo Castro was the son and secretary of Henry Castro.)

Clusky, Michael W., The Political Text-Book (13th edition). Philadelphia, 1860. (Contains documentary material bearing on the Know-Nothing movement.)

Congressional Globe 1850-1860.

Considerant, Victor, European Colonization in Texas. New York, 1855.

———, On Texas, Paris, 1855. (Considerant visited Texas about 1852, and in 1855 he founded a colony of Socialists there.)

Crane, William C., Life and Select Literary Remains of Sam Houston. Philadelphia, 1884. (Contains documents relative to state affairs.)

Debates in the Several State Conventions on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution, 5 vols., Jonathan Elliot (editor). Philadelphia, 1836-1859.

Debates in the Texas Constitutional Convention of 1845. Archives, University of Texas Library.

Debates in the Texas Legislature, 1855-1859. Archives, Texas State Library.

De Bow, J. D. B., Statistical View of the United States. Washington, D. C., 1854. (A compendium of the Seventh Census.)

Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas, 3 vols., George P. Garrison (editor). Washington, D. C., 1908-1911.

Gammel, H. P. N., The Laws of Texas (1822-1897), 10 vols. Austin, 1898. (Contains legislative acts, ordinances and decrees. Vols. I, II and III drawn on in this work.)

Jones, Anson, Memoranda and Official Correspondence relating to the Republic of Texas: Its History and Annexation. New York, 1857. (Jones was the last president of the Republic of Texas and an outstanding anti-nativist.)

Journal of the Federal Convention by James Madison, E. H. Scott (editor). Chicago, 1898.

Journal of the Texas Convention of 1836. Houston, 1838.

Journals of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the Republic of Texas. 1840-1845.

Journal of the Texas Constitutional Convention of 1845, Austin, 1845.

Kapp, Friederich, Aus and Ueber Amerika, 2 vols. Berlin, 1876.

Lamar, Mirabeau B., The Papers of. Charles A. Gulick and Katherine Elliott (editors) 5 vols. Austin, 1921.

Linn, John J., The Reminiscences of Fifty Years in Texas. New York, 1883.

Lubbock, Francis R., Six Decades in Texas. Austin, 1900.

National Pastorals of the American Hierarchy (1792-1919). Peter Guilday (editor). Washington, D. C., 1923.

Olmsted, Frederick L., A Journey Through Texas. New York, 1856. (Olmsted made this trip in 1855 and made a close study of the attitude of the Americans and Germans towards each other.)

Reagan, John H., Memoirs, Walter F. McCaleb (editor). New York, 1906.

Report of the Senate Committee in Regard to Naturalization Laws and European Immigration. Austin, 1856.

Sayles, James and Henry, Early Laws of Texas. 3 vols., St. Louis, 1888.

Schurz, Carl, Reminiscences, 3 vols., New York, 1909.

Select Speeches of Kossuth, Francis W. Newman (editor). London, 1853.

Senate Journals of the State Legislature 1846-1857. University of Texas Library.

Spalding, M. J., Evidences of Catholicity. Baltimore, 1847.

Texas, Journal of the Consultation held at San Felipe de Austin. . . . October 16, 1835.

Winkler, E. W., Platforms of Political Parties in Texas. Austin, 1916.

Wooten, Dudley G., A Comprehensive History of Texas, 2 vols., Dallas, 1898.

Works of Rt. Rev. John England, I. A. Reynolds (editor). Baltimore, 1849.

Writings of Thomas Jefferson, 9 vols., H. A. Washington (editor). Washington, D. C., 1854.

Writings of James Madison, 9 vols., G. Hunt, (editor). New York, 1900-1910.

Writings of George Washington, 12 vols., Jared Sparks (editor). New York, 1847.

2. Periodicals and Newspapers

Atlantische Studien von Deutschen in Amerika, Vols. 1 to 8. Goettingen, 1853-1857.

Der Deutsche Pionier, Errinnerungen aus dem Pionier Leben des Deutschen in Amerika, Vols. 1-18. Cincinnati, 1869-1885. (Both periodicals contain miscellaneous articles written by Germans of note who lived in Texas during the Know-Nothing period.)

The Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association and its successor, The Southwestern Historical Quarterly 1897-1930. (Contains reminiscences and other documentary material.)

The Catholic Register and Freeman's Journal. The official organ of the Diocese of New York. Files (1840-1860) in the N. C. W. C. Library, Washington, D. C.

The New York Herald, 1854-1860, Know-Nothing in sympathies. Files in the Library of Congress.

The New York Tribune, 1854-1860, an anti-Know-Nothing paper. Files in the Library of Congress.

Texas papers. Files for the periods indicated.

Neu Braunfelser Zeitung (New Braunfels) 1854-1860. Texas State Library, Austin.

Northern Standard (Clarksville) 1854-1860. Democratic paper. Texas State Library, Austin.

Telegraph and Texas Register (Houston) 1836-1845. Texas State University Library, Austin.

Texas National Register, 1845-1846. Texas State University Library, Austin.

Texas Presbyterian (Houston) 1851-1856. Sectarian paper anti-Catholic in tone. Texas State University Library, Austin.

Texas Republican (Marshall) 1850-1860. Democratic paper. Texas State Library, Austin.

Texas State Gazette (Austin) 1849-1860. Democratic paper. Congressional Library, Texas State Library, and Texas University Library, Austin.

Texas State Times (Austin) 1855-1858. Know-Nothing paper. Texas State Library, Austin.

The America (Washington) 1855-1857. Know-Nothing paper. Texas State Library, Austin.

The Herald (San Antonio) 1857-1859. Know-Nothing paper. Texas State Library, Austin.

The Intelligencer (Austin) 1856-1859. Democratic paper. Library of Congress.

The Journal (Galveston) 1850-1854. Whig and later a Know-Nothing paper. Texas State Library and Texas State University Library, Austin.

The Ledger (San Antonio) 1855-1857. Democratic paper. Library of Congress.

The News (Galveston) 1852-1857. Democratic paper. Library of Congress and Texas State Library, Austin.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Anonymous, A Complete Exposure of the Order of the Know-Nothings. Philadelphia, 1854.

Anonymous, The Sons of the Sires: A History of the Rise, Progress and Destiny of the American Party. Philadelphia, 1855. (A contemporary defence of the American Party.)

Baker, Thomas S., Lenau and Young Germany in America. Philadelphia, 1897. (Ph. D. dissertation at Johns Hopkins University.)

Bancroft, Hubert H., North Mexican States and Texas, 2 vols. San Francisco, 1883 and 1889.

———, History of California, Vol. 6. San Francisco, 1890.

Barker, Eugene C., Mexico and Texas, 1821-1835. Dallas, 1928.

———, "Public Opinion in Texas Preceding the Revolution," American Historical Association Annual Report . . . for the Year 1911. Washington, 1913.

———, The Life of Stephen F. Austin. Dallas, 1925.

Benjamin, Gilbert G., The Germans in Texas. Philadelphia, 1909.

Black, J. H., Maryland's Attitude in the Struggle for Canada. Baltimore, 1892. (Johns Hopkins University Studies, Vol. VII, tenth series.)

Bracht, Viktor, Texas im Jahre 1848. Elberfeld und Iserlohn, 1849.

Bromwell, William J. History of Immigration 1819-1855. New York, 1856.

Brown, John H., History of Texas, 2 Vols. St. Louis, 1893.

Bruncken, Ernest, German Political Refugees in America 1815-1860. Chicago, 1904.

Bugbee, Lester G., "Slavery in Early Texas", Political Science Quarterly, Vol. 13, 1898.

Carroll, Anna E., The Great American Battle, or the Contest between Christianity and Political Romanism. New York, 1856.

Chadwick, F. E. Causes of the Civil War (1859-1861). New York, 1906.

Cobb, Sanford H., The Rise of Religious Toleration in America. New York, 1902.

Cole, Arthur C., The Whig Party in the South. Washington, 1913.

Cole, Cornelius, Memoirs. New York, 1908.

David Edward. History of Texas. Cincinnati, 1836.

De Cordova, Jacob, Texas: Her Resources and Her Public Men. Philadelphia, 1858.

Desmond, Humphrey J., The Know-Nothing Party. Washington, 1905.

Faust, Albert B., The German Element in the United States. New York, 1927.

Foote, Henry S., Texas and the Texans, 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1841.

Franklin, F. G., The Legislative History of Naturalization in the United States. Chicago, 1906.

Fulton, Justin D., The Outlook of Freedom or The Roman Catholic Element in American History. Cincinnati, 1856.

Garrison, George P., A Contest of Civilization. New York, 1903.

———, "Southwestern History in the Southwest," American Historical Association Annual Report . . . for the year 1901. Washington, 1902.

Greeley, Horace, The American Conflict, 2 vols. Hartford, 1873.

Hambleton, James P., A Biographical Sketch of Henry A. Wise with a History of the Political Campaign in Virginia in 1855. Richmond, 1856.

Haynes, George H., "A Know-Nothing Legislature," American Historical Association Annual Report . . . for the year 1896.

———, "The Causes of Know-Nothing Success," American Historical Review, Vol. 3, October, 1897.

Holley, Mrs. Mary Austin, Texas. Kentucky, 1836.

Humphrey, Edward F., Nationalism and Religion in America 1774-1789. Boston, 1924.

Johnson and Barker, Texas and Texans, 5 vols. Chicago, 1914.

Julian, George W., Political Recollections 1840-1872. Chicago, 1884.

Kennedy, William, The Rise, Progress and Prospects of the Republic of Texas, 2 vols. London, 1841.

Koerner, Gustav, Das Deutsche Element in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nord Amerika 1818-1848. Cincinnati, 1880.

Lauer, Paul E., Church and State in New England (Johns Hopkins University Studies, series 10, No. 10.) Baltimore, 1892.

Lee, John H., The Origin and Progress of the American Party in Politics. Philadelphia, 1855.

Leonard, Lewis A., Life of Charles Carroll of Carrollton. New York, 1918.
Longstreet, Augustus P., Know-Nothingism Unveiled. Washington, 1855.
Macy, Jesse, Political Parties in the United States 1846-1861. New York, 1900.
Maguire, John F., The Irish in America. New York, 1873.
McMaster, J. B., A History of the People of the United States, 8 vols. New York, 1883-1913.
———, With the Fathers. New York, 1896.
Pike, James S., The First Blows of the Civil War. New York, 1873.
Porter, Kirk H., A History of the Suffrage in the United States. Chicago, 1918.
Rhodes, James F., History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850, 8 vols. New York, 1909-1919.
Sanderson, John P., Views and Opinions of American Statesmen on Foreign Immigration, Philadelphia, 1856.
Schmeckebier, Laurence F., The Know-Nothing Party in Maryland. Baltimore, 1899 (Johns Hopkins University Studies).
Schouler, James, History of the United States of America under the Constitution. 6 vols. New York, 1880-1899.
Scisco, Louis D., Political Nativism in New York State. New York, 1901.
Shea, John G., A History of the Catholic Church in the United States, 4 vols. New York, 1892.
———, Life and Times of Archbishop Carroll. New York, 1888.
Smith, Theodore C., Parties and Slavery (1850-1859). New York, 1906.
Stanwood, Edward, A History of Presidential Elections. (Fourth edition revised) Boston, 1896.
———, A History of the Presidency. Boston, 1912.
Stickney, Charles, Know-Nothingism in Rhode Island. Providence, 1894.
Stock, Leo F., "The United States at the Court of Pius IX," Catholic Historical Review, N. S., Vol. III.
Turner, Frederick J., Rise of the New West (1819-1829). New York, 1906.
Tuska, Benjamin, "Know-Nothingism in Baltimore 1854-1860," Catholic Historical Review, New Series, Vol. 5, 1925.
Von Holst, Herman, The Constitutional and Political History of the United States, Vols. I-VI. Chicago, 1885-1889.
Whitney, Thomas R., A Defence of the American Policy. New York, 1856.
Wilson, Henry, History of the Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America, 2 vols. Boston, 1875.
Yoakum, H. H., History of Texas, 2 vols. New York, 1856.

INDEX

Adams, John, 3.
Adamson, J., 40.
Alien Act of 1789, 5; repeal of, 5.
American Republican party, organization of, 9; causes assigned for existence of, 9.
Anglo-American immigration to Texas, 27; effects of, 27.
Anglo-American immigrants, characteristics of, 28.
Arciniega, Miguel, 30.
Austin, Stephen F., attitude toward slavery, 30; sentiments toward Catholicism, 33; prison journal of, 34; draft of Federal Constitution by, 34.

Banks, N. P., Speaker of the House of Representatives, election of, 19.
Baylor, R. E., Grand President of the Know-Nothing party in Texas, election of, 80.
Bedini, Cardinal, visit of to United States, 15; hostility caused by official reception of, 15; hostility aroused by decision in controversy over the administration of ecclesiastical property, 15-16.
Bell, James H., 169.
Bell, P. H., 82.
Breckinridge-Lane ticket, 181.
Bourgeois, Alexander, 41.
Broome, Jacob, 106.
Brutus' letters, publication of, 6.
Bryan, Guy M., nomination of, 157.
Buchanan, James, presidential nomination of, 20; ratification of nomination, 143; misrepresentation of attitude toward slavery, 145.
Buckley, C. W., 82-83, 169.

Caldwell, John, 51.
Campaigns, of 1844, 9 f.; of 1855, 80 f.; of 1856, 135 f.; of 1857, 156 f.; of 1859, 169 f.
Cart War, 166-169; governor's message on, 166; governor's message referred to committee on state affairs, 166; report of joint committee in reference to, 166.
Castro, Henri, 41; colonists introduced by, 76.
Catholic Church, bogus oaths and anathemas ascribed to, 112-113; charge against, of hostility toward American political institutions, 114-115; extension of through immigration and hostility toward, 115; hostility to missionary activities of, 115.
Catholic Emancipation Act, hostility caused by passage of, 6, 23.
Chaplin, candidate for alcalde of Nacogdoches, 27.
Chilton, George W., resolution introduced by, 173.
Cincinnati Society, 107.
Clark, Edward, candidacy of for lieutenant-governorship, 171.
Clayton, John M., prominent nativist, 106; amendment to Kansas-Nebraska Act introduced by, 110.
Coahuila and Texas, legislative decrees of, 35, 36.
Colonization contracts, hostility toward, 43; debate in the Constitutional Convention of 1845 on, 56-58.
Colonization, national law of 1823, 25; abrogation of law of 1823, 25; national law of 1824, 25; essential characteristics of national law of 1824, 25; state law of 1825, 25; state law of 1832, 31.
Considerant, Victor, colonists introduced by, 76-77; anti-Catholicism of, 77.
Council on military affairs, committee report of, 36.
Crosby, Stephen, 84, 158, 171.

Decree of April 6, 1830, significant articles of, 31.
Democratic Associations, formation of, 123-124.
Democratic party in Texas, attempts at reorganization of, 62-66; press of, 84-85; public speakers of denounce Know-Nothingism, 85-86; mass meetings of, 87; barbecue, 121; state central committee of, 62, 136; delegates of to the National Convention of 1856, 136; State Convention of 1856, 136; State platform of 1856, 137-138; State

ticket of 1856, 136; State Convention of 1857, 156; State ticket of 1857, 157; State Convention of 1859, 171; State ticket of 1859, 171.
Devine, Mayor of San Antonio, 156.
Dickson, D. C., 80.
Ducos, Armand, 41.

Education, Catholic, hostility toward, 116-118.
Election returns, for 1855, 98-102; for 1856, 147-151 and 152-154; for 1857, 161-165; for 1859, 176-179.
Evans, L. D., 53, 84, 158.
Fayette County, resolutions of mass meeting in, 128-130.
Federalist party, 3.
Fields, William, 83.
Filibustering, 170, 172.
Fillmore, Millard, 20, 106; Albany speech of, 143-144; Erie letter of, 144-145; ticket of temporarily ignored in Texas, 143.
Fisher, Henry, 41.
Forfeiture clause, debate on in the Texas Constitutional Convention, 58-61.
Fredonian Republic, proclamation of, 28.
Freie Verein, 71.
Frémont, John C., candidate of the Republican party for the presidency in 1856, 20.
Frontin, T., 40.

Galveston, elections in, 79; mass meeting in, 89; resolutions of mass meeting in, 89-91.
General land office, report of commissioner of, 43.
German communities, characteristics of, 69; national ideals fostered by German societies, 69-70; charged with abolitionism, 92-94; charge of abolitionism repelled, 94-95; mass meetings of, 95; resolutions adopted at mass meetings, 95-97.
Gesellschaft zum Schutze Auswanderer nach Texas, 68-69.
Gonzales County, mass meeting in, 91; resolutions of, 91.
Grimes, Jesse, 158.
Guadalupe Hidalgo, the treaty of, 167.
Guerrero, president of Mexico, 30; decree of, 30.

Hamilton, Alexander, 3.
Hamilton, A. J., 171.
Hancock, John, 84.
Harris County, mass meeting in, 130; resolutions of, 130.
Hartford Convention, nativistic resolutions of, 5.
Holy Alliance, rise of, 5; hostility of to the spread of Republican institutions, 5.
Houston, Sam, 43, 44; letter of, 106-111; Know-Nothing speech of at barbecue, 121-122; vote of on Kansas-Nebraska bill condemned, 133; letter of, to President Pierce, 145; resolutions in condemnation of, 132-133; candidate for governor in 1857, 158; candidate for governor in 1859, 171.

Independent ticket, 158, 171.
Iturbide, Emperor of Mexico, 25.

Jackson, President, 7, 108, 109, 110.
Jesuit Order, hostility caused by revival of, 6.
Johnson, M. T., 83.

Kansas-Nebraska bill, 110.
Kapp, Frederick, 68.
Kennedy, William, 41.
Know-Nothing party, organization of, 14; dual characteristics of, 16; factors in rapid growth, 14; first general convention of, 16; second general convention of, 16; success in 1854, 17; success in 1855, 18; reorganization of, 22; encouraged by sectarian press, 77-78; secret State Convention, 79-80; officers of Grand Council of Texas, 80; State ticket of 1855, 80; withdrawals from, 86; attack on foreign element, 103; attack on the Catholic Church repelled, 104-106; barbecue, 121; principles asserted in the legislature 134-135; State Convention of 1856, 139; presidential electors of 1856, 139; State ticket of 1856, 139; Committee on state platform of 1856, 139; delegates to the National convention of 1856, 139; platform of 1856, 139-141; ratification meetings of 1856, 144.
Kossuth, Louis, reception of, 12; anti-Catholic speeches of, 12.

Land Acts of 1636, 1; of State of Coahuila and Texas of 1834, 36; of Republic of Texas of 1837, 39; abrogation of land act of 1837, 39; act of the Republic of Texas of 1841, 40.
Lecompton Constitution, 21, 169, 170.
Leon County, mass meeting in, 124; resolutions of, 124-125.
Leopoldine Society, founding of, 6.
Lubbock, Francis R., 160, 171, 174.

Madison, James, 3.
Marriage, civil law of Mexico relative to, 32.
Marshall, John, 156.
McDonald, John S., 156.
McLennan County, mass meeting in, 126; resolutions of, 126-128.
Medina County, mass meeting in, 91; resolutions of, 91-92.
Mexican Revolution, effect of on slavery in Mexico, 29.
Mexicans, characteristics of, 28; hostility toward, 66; economic grievances against, 68; political grievances against, 67-68.
Miller, Burchard, 41.
Miller, W. D., 43.
Mills, John T., 82.
Missions, secularization of, 25.
Monroe, James, 7.
Morris, Gouveneur, 3.
Morse, Samuel F. B., 6.

Nacogdoches, department of, 27.
Nativism, defined, 1; origin and development of, 1-8; Native American press, 7; Native American Democratic Association, 8; Native American party, 10; nativism in Texas State Constitutional Convention of 1845, 46-61; see also Know-Nothingism.
Navarro, José, 30, 48.
Norris, Samuel, election of, 27; alcalde of Nacogdoches, 28.
Nueces County, mass meeting in, 124; resolutions of, 124.

Oaths taken by the Know-Nothing party, 193.
Ochiltree, W. B., 52, 171.
Oldham, W. S., 81, 158.
Opposition party, 22, 170, 173.

Padilla, 30.
Papacy, opinions on the civil jurisdiction of given by Faculties of Divinity of the Universities of Paris, Louvain, Salamanca, etc., 119; opinions on given by Eighth Provincial Council of Baltimore, 119; by Bishop England, 120; by Bishop Spalding, 120.
Patton, John M., 8.
Pease, Governor E. M., 80, 81, 83, 84, 89, 168.
Pierce, Franklin, nomination of, 13.
Pierson, Victor, 42.
Poinsett, 31.
Political refugees in Texas, 71; platform of principles of, 72-76.
Protestant Associations, founding of, 7.

Quebec Act, significance of, 2.

Raymond, James H., 136.
Reagan, John H., 157, 159, 171, 172.
Republican party, 17, 20.
Revolution of 1688, 2.
Runnels, H. R., 157, 171, 172.
Rusk, Thomas J., 46, 49, 51.

San Antonio, mass meeting in, 87; resolutions of mass meeting in, 87-88; correspondence committee of, 89; campaign of 1856 in, 155.
Schlegel, Frederick, political views of, 6.
Scott, Winfield, nomination of, 13.
Scurry, W. R., 158.
Slaves, emancipation of, 29.
Slave property, measures for the protection of, 66-67.
Slave trade, 29, 170, 172, 173.

Taney, Roger B., federal appointment of, 7.
Taylor-Fillmore administration, 63.
Travis County, resolutions of mass meeting in, 81-82.

Virginia Campaign of 1855, moral effect of, 18.

Ward, Thomas Wm., report of, 43.
Washington County, mass meeting in, 125; resolutions of, 125-126.
Washington, George, letters of on religious toleration, 107-108.
Waul, T. N., 171.
White, F. M., 171.
Wigfall, L. D., 158.
Wilcox, J. H., 105.
Willie, James, 136.

Young Men's Democratic Association, organization of, 131; resolutions

ERRATA

Page 9, line 37: *being appraised*, read: *being apprised.*

P. 68, l. 31: *Castrell*, read: *Castell.*

P. 71, l. 49: *Siemberg*, read: *Siemering.*

P. 80, l. 14: *Powers*, read: *Jowers.*

P. 83, l. 11: *Williams Fields*, read: *William Fields.*

P. 85, l. 26: *New Braunsfeller*, read: *New Braunfelser.*

P. 169, note 147: *C. J. Buckley*, read: *C. W. Buckley.*

P. 171, l. 22: *G. N. Waul*, read: *T. N. Waul.*

P. 171, l. 30: *Wauls*, read: *Waul.*

976.4 P28
McGrath, Paul of the Cross,
Political nativism ><1825-1860
MT. MARY COLL. ocm01802453
3 8920 99033281 4

12390 976.4 P28
AUTHOR Sister Paul McGrath
TITLE Political nativism in Texas, 1825-1860.
DATE DUE

12390 Mount Mary College MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN 976.4 P28

LIBRARY

1. Books may be kept one week and may be renewed once for the same period, except reference books and magazines.

2. Reference books, such as encyclopedias and dictionaries are to be used only in the library.

3. Reserved books may be borrowed subject to library regulations.

4. A fine of two cents a day will be charged on each book which is not returned according to the rules.

5. Injury to books beyond reasonable wear and all losses shall be paid for.

6. No books may be taken from the library without being charged.